arXiv:math/0510327v1 [math.AP] 16 Oct 2005

Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. IV. Multidimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field. Full-rank case

Victor Ivrii*†‡

March 14, 2005

Abstract

This paper is a continuation of [BrIvr] and [Ivr1, Ivr5, Ivr6]. I derive sharp spectral asymptotics (with the remainder estimate $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}+\mu^{\frac{d}{2}-1}h^{1-\frac{d}{2}})$ for d-dimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field; here h and μ are Plank and binding constants respectively and magnetic intensity matrix has full rank at each point.

0 Introduction

0.0 Preface

In this paper I consider multidimensional Schrödinger operator

$$A = A_0 + V(x), \qquad A_0 = \sum_{j,k\le d} P_j g^{jk}(x) P_k, \tag{0.1}$$

$$P_j = hD_j - \mu V_j(x), \quad h\in(0,1],\ \mu\ge 1.$$

*Work was partially supported by NSERC grant OGP0138277.

†Work was partially supported by Canada Council for the Arts via Killam Program.

‡Important parts of the research were done in July 2002 when the author was visiting Université Paris-Nord and in March 2003 when the author was visiting Banff International Research Station.

It is characterized by *magnetic field intensity matrices* (F_{jk}) with $F_{jk} = (\partial_{x_j} V_k - \partial_{x_k} V_j)$, which is skew-symmetric $d \times d$-matrix, and $(F^j_p) = (g^{jk})(F_{kp})$ which is equivalent to skew-symmetric matrix $(g^{jk})^{\frac{1}{2}}(F_{jk})(g^{jk})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then all eigenvalues of (F^j_k) are $\pm i f_p$ ($f_l > 0$, $p = 1, \dots, r$) and 0 of multiplicity $d - 2r$ where $2r = \operatorname{rank}(F^j_k)$.

In this paper I assume that magnetic field intensity matrix has a full rank:

$$\operatorname{rank}(F^j_k) = 2r = d, \quad |(F^j_k)^{-1}| \le c_0 \tag{0.2}$$

and (under certain conditions) I derive sharp spectral asymptotics (with the remainder estimate $O\big(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + \mu^{\frac{d}{2}-1}h^{1-\frac{d}{2}}\big)$). The typical example (already studied in [Ivr1, Ivr6]) is 2-dimensional magnetic Schrödinger operator.

I consider operator in some domain or on some manifold X with some boundary conditions, assuming that it is self-adjoint in $L^2(X)$ and denote by $e(x, y, \tau)$ Schwartz' kernel of it spectral projector.

0.1 Canonical form

It is known (see e.g. [Ivr1], Chapter 6) that if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and g^{jk}, F_{jk}, V are constant then operator is unitary equivalent to

$$\sum_{1\le j\le r} f_j(h^2D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2) + \sum_{r+1\le j\le d-2r} h^2D_j^2 + V \tag{0.3}$$

and $e(x, x, \tau) = \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_d(\tau)$ where under condition (0.2) [1)]

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_d(\tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} (2\pi)^{-r}\mu^r h^{-r} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \theta\Big(\tau - \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) f_j \mu h - V\Big) f_1 \cdots f_r \sqrt{g} \tag{0.4}$$

with $g = \det(g_{jk})$, $(g_{jk}) = (g^{jk})^{-1}$ and Heaviside function θ.

In particular, under condition (0.2) (and only in this case) spectrum is pure-point (of infinite multiplicity) consisting of *Landau levels* $E_\alpha \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) f_j$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}$.

Now in the general case (for variable V and, may be, g^{jk}, F_{jk}) I am interested in asymptotics of $\int \psi(x) e(x, x, 0)\, dx$ as $h \to +0, \mu \to +\infty$ where ψ is a fixed function, smooth and

[1)] For $2r < d$

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_d(\tau) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \omega_{d-2r}(2\pi)^{-d+r}\mu^r h^{-d+r} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \Big(\tau - \sum_j (2\alpha_j + 1) f_j \mu h - V\Big)_+^{\frac{d}{2}-r} f_1 \cdots f_r \sqrt{g} \tag{0.4}^*$$

where ω_k is a volume of unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^k$ and $2r = \operatorname{rank}(F_{jk})$.

compactly supported in X. The principal part of such asymptotics under some reasonable and obvious conditions is of magnitude $h^{-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r}$. On the other hand, the remainder estimate is $O(\mu h^{1-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r})$ unless one imposes some non-degeneracy condition while under the strongest possible condition one can expect remainder estimate $O\big(\mu^{-1}h^{1-2r}+\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r}\big)$.

It is known [Ivr1] that in the smooth case for $d=2$ one can reduce operator in question to canonical form

$$\sum_{m+k\ge 1} \mu^{2-2k-2m-j} a_{m,k,j}(x_2,\mu^{-1}hD_2)\big(h^2D_1^2+\mu^2x_1^2\big)^m h^j \tag{0.5}$$

with $a_{1,0}=F\circ\Psi_0$, $a_{0,1}=V\circ\Psi_0$ and certain diffeomorphism $\Psi_0: T\mathbb{R}^1\to\mathbb{R}^2$. Then one can replace harmonic oscillator $h^2D_1^2+\mu^2x_1^2$ by one of its eigenvalues $(2\alpha+1)\mu h$; we ignore terms with $j\ge 1$.

So, for $\mu h\le \epsilon_0$ our operator looks like a family (with $C_0(\mu h)^{-1}$ elements) of 1-dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos with principal symbols $\big((2\alpha+1)\mu hF+V\big)\circ\Psi_0$. Spectral asymptotics for them is very sensitive to a degeneracy of the symbol but under non-degeneracy condition $|b|+|\nabla b|\ge\epsilon_1$, $b=a_{0,1}+a_{1,0}$ it has a principal part of magnitude μh^{-1} and a remainder $O(1)$. This non-degeneracy condition is equivalent to $|\nabla V/F|\ge\epsilon_1$ and the final asymptotics has its principal part of magnitude h^{-2} and a remainder $O(\mu^{-1}h^{-1})$.

As $\mu h\ge\epsilon_0$ we have the family of no more than C_0 of $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos, non-degeneracy condition transforms into $|(2\alpha+1)\mu h(V/F)|+|\nabla(V/F)|\ge\epsilon_1$ and the final asymptotics has its principal part of magnitude μh^{-1} and a remainder $O(1)$.

Non-smoothness prevents us from complete canonical form but we have "poor man" precanonical form which is sufficient [Ivr6].

Multidimensional case is much more tricky. Under condition (0.2) one could expect canonical form

$$\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r},k:|m|+k\ge 1} \mu^{2-2k-2|m|} a_{m,k}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')H^m \tag{0.6}$$

with $H=(H_1,\dots,H_r)$, harmonic oscillators $H_j=h^2D_j^2+\mu^2x_j^2$ and $a_{(m,0)}=f_j\circ\Psi_0$ as $m_k=\delta_{jk}$, $a_{(0,1)}=V\circ\Psi_0$, diffeomorphism $\Psi_0: T\mathbb{R}^r=\mathbb{R}^{2r}\to\mathbb{R}^{2r}$, $x''=(x_{r+1},\dots,x_{2r})$.

In this case for $\mu h\le\epsilon_0$ one would get a family (with $(\mu h)^{-r}$ elements) of r-dimensional $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos and under proper non-degeneracy condition $|\nabla(f_j/V)|\ge\epsilon_1$ the principal part of asymptotics for them would be of magnitude $\mu^r h^{-r}$ and a remainder $O(\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r})$ and the final asymptotics has its principal part of magnitude h^{-2r} and a remainder $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-r})$.

As $\mu h\ge\epsilon_0$ one would have the family of no more than C_0 of $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos, under proper non-degeneracy condition $|b|+\nabla b|\ge\epsilon_1$, $b\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\sum_j(2\alpha_j+1)\mu hf_j+V$, the final asymptotics has its principal part of magnitude $\mu^r h^{-r}$ and a remainder $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-r})$.

0.2 Resonances

However, the resonances prevent us from reducing our operator to the desired canonical form. In fact, *m-th order resonances*

$$\sum_j f_j\gamma_j = 0 \qquad \text{as } \gamma\in\mathbb{Z}^r \text{ and } |\gamma| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_j |\gamma_j| = m \ge 2 \tag{0.7}$$

prevent us from reducing properly terms

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta:|\alpha|+|\beta|=m;\ k} \mu^{2-k-|\alpha|-|\beta|} a_{\alpha,k}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')(hD')^\alpha(\mu x')^\beta. \tag{0.8}$$

In particular, due to the second order resonances we can reduce the main part of operator only to

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}}\sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')Z_j^*Z_k + a_0(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{0.9}$$

with $Z_k = hD_k + i\mu x_k$ where $\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}$ are disjoint subsets of $\{1,\dots,r\}$ and eigenvalues of each of matrices $(a_{jk})_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}}$ are close to one another. This leads to the necessity of the matrix rather than the scalar non-degeneracy (microhyperbolicity) condition.

Further, the third order resonances $f_i = f_j+f_k$ (with possible $j=k$) prevent us from getting rid off the terms $\mu^{-1}a_{jkl}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')Z_j^*Z_kZ_l$ and their adjoints $\mu^{-1}a_{jkl}^*(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')Z_jZ_k^*Z_l^*$ and these terms appear as perturbations of the main part of operator unless F_{jk} and g^{jk} are constant.

The fourth order resonances $f_i = f_j+f_k+f_l$ and $f_i+f_j = f_k+f_l$ leave us with the whole bunch of terms instead of $\mu^{-2}H_j^2$ but these terms are smaller than those produced by the third order resonances and so on.

More precisely, the symbol of the reduced operator is

$$\mu^2\sum_{\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}}\sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k + a_0 + \mu^2\sum_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathfrak{N}}\sum_{j,k,l\in\mathfrak{n}} \operatorname{Re} a_{jkl}\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k\zeta_l + \dots \tag{0.10}$$

where $\zeta_j = \xi_j + ix_j$, † means complex conjugation for scalars and Hermitian conjugation for matrices; precise definition of $\mathfrak{N}$ will appear later.

In order to recover the desired remainder estimate we need to consider *propagator trace* $\operatorname{Tr}\bigl(e^{-ih^{-1}tA}\bigr)$ for $|t|\le T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon\mu$ with small constant ϵ.

Note that the Poisson brackets of this symbol with $a_{\mathfrak{m}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i,j\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k$ are of magnitude 1 and therefore variation of $a_{\mathfrak{m}}$ at time interval $[-T_1,T_1]$ is not necessarily small.

On the other hand, higher order terms have $O(\mu^{-1})$ gradients and therefore the Poisson brackets of (0.10) with

$$a^0_{\mathfrak{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{n}} a_{jk}\zeta^\dagger_j\zeta_k + \mu^{-1}\sum_{j,k,l\in\mathfrak{n}} \operatorname{Re} a_{jkl}\zeta^\dagger_j\zeta_k\zeta_l \tag{0.11}$$

are of magnitude μ^{-1} and therefore variation of $a_{\mathfrak{n}}$ at time interval $[-T_1, T_1]$ is small. Therefore, in the microhyperbolicity condition we need to consider $a_{\mathfrak{n}}$ rather than $a_{\mathfrak{m}}$; however, the third-order terms actually do not appear in this condition.

0.3 Microhyperbolicity

Thus we arrive to the final *microhyperbolicity condition* at point $\bar{z} = (\bar{x}'', \bar{\xi}'')$ and thus at point $\bar{x} = \Psi_0^{-1}(z)$.

Condition 0.1. Assume that

(0.12) First of all we assume that set $\{1, \dots, r\}$ is split into disjoint groups $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M}(\bar{z})$ and matrix (a_{ij}) is block-diagonal and in a small vicinity of $\bar{z}$ its blocks are close to scalar matrices $f_{\mathfrak{m}} I_{\#\mathfrak{m}}$ where $f_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are disjoint.

(0.13) Further, we assume that set $\{1, \dots, r\}$ is split into larger disjoint groups $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathfrak{N}(\bar{z})$ such that no intergroup third order resonance is possible:

$$|f_i - f_j - f_k| \le \epsilon_0 \implies i, j, k \in \mathfrak{n} \text{ for some } \mathfrak{n}.$$

(0.14) Finally, we assume that for each $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathfrak{N}}$ such that $|\sum_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathfrak{N}} \tau_{\mathfrak{n}} + V| \le \epsilon$ there exists vector $\ell = \ell(\bar{z}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2r}$ such that

$$\mu^2 \sum_{j,k} \bigl(\ell(a_{jk}a_0^{-1})\bigr)\zeta^\dagger_j\zeta_k \ge \epsilon_1 \tag{0.15}$$

as long as

$$\sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{n}} a_{jk}\zeta^\dagger_j\zeta_k = \mu^2\tau_{\mathfrak{n}} \qquad \forall \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^r\ \forall \mathfrak{n} \in \mathfrak{N}. \tag{0.16}$$

To impose this condition we need to assume first that a_0 does not vanish:

$$|V| \ge \epsilon_0. \tag{0.17}$$

Condition 0.2. This microhyperbolicity condition should be modified as $\mu h \ge \epsilon_0$: in (0.15) – (0.16) one needs to consider only $\tau_{\mathfrak{n}} = \sum_{i\in\mathfrak{n}} (2\alpha_i + 1)\mu h f_i$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$; now $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ runs a discrete set.

On the other hand, for constant F_j^k condition (0.15)-(0.16) is equivalent to

$$|\nabla V| \ge \epsilon_1; \tag{0.18}$$

and for $\mu h \ge \epsilon_0$ one should modify it to

$$|\sum_i (2\alpha_i + 1)\mu h + V| + |\nabla V| \ge \epsilon_1 \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}. \tag{0.19}$$

Then we basically do not need condition (0.17). Also in this case ℓ does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\tau}$.

Situation becomes even more tricky due to non-smoothness of coefficients. Let us list our assumptions first.

0.4 Assumptions and results

0.4.1 Assumptions

We assume that in $B(0,1)$ the following conditions together with (0.2), (0.17) hold:

$$c^{-1} \le \sum_{jk} g^{jk}\xi_j\xi_k \le c \qquad \forall \xi : |\xi| = 1, \tag{0.20}$$

$$g^{jk} \in C^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}\big(B(0,1)\big), \tag{0.21}$$

$$V_j = \partial_j \phi_j, \qquad \phi_j \in C^{\bar{l}+2,\bar{\sigma}} \tag{0.22}$$

$$V \in C^{l,\sigma} \tag{0.23}$$

where $C^{l,\sigma}$ for is a class of functions such that its l_0-derivatives are continuous with continuity modulus $t^{l-l_0}|\log t|^{-\sigma}$ where $l_0 = \lfloor l \rfloor$ unless $l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\sigma < 0$ in which case $l_0 = l - 1$.

I suspect that condition (0.22) is rather technical and one can replace it by a more natural assumption

$$F_{jk} \in C^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}} \tag{0.22$'$}$$

Further, in the non-smooth case our theorems deal not with spectral kernel $e(x,y,\tau)$ of the original operator A but with spectral kernel $\tilde{e}(x,y,\tau)$ of it *framing approximations* $\tilde{A}$ [2)].

[2)] One can take two copies $\tilde{A}^{\pm}$ of approximation such that our estimates hold for both and $\tilde{A}^- \le A \le \tilde{A}^+$ in the operator sense. We call them *framing approximations*.

0.4.2 Results: weak magnetic field

The first statement deals with a (respectively) weak magnetic field:

Theorem 0.3. *Let conditions (0.2), (0.17), (0.20)-(0.23) with* $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (l,\sigma) \succeq (1,2)$ *and condition 0.1 be fulfilled and*

$$\psi \in C_0^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}\big(B(0,\frac{1}{2})\big), \quad 0 \le \psi \le 1. \tag{0.24}$$

Let $\mu \le h^{\delta-1}$ *with arbitrarily small exponent* $\delta > 0$.

(i) Assume that one of the following two conditions is fulfilled:

(a) $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ [3)]

(b) $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ *and* $(l,\sigma) \succeq (1,2)$.

Then the following estimate holds:

$$\mathcal{R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big|\int \Big(\tilde{e}(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0)\Big)\psi(x)dx\Big| \le \tag{0.25}$$
$$C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + C(\mu h)^{l}|\log h|^{l-\sigma}h^{-d} + C\mu(\mu h)^{\bar{l}+1}|\log h|^{\bar{l}+1-\bar{\sigma}}h^{-d};$$

(ii) In the general case for $(l,\sigma) \prec (2,0)$ *the following estimate holds:*

$$\mathcal{R} \le C\mu^{1-l}h^{1-d}|\log \mu|^{-\sigma} + C(\mu h)^{l}|\log h|^{l-\sigma}h^{-d} + C\mu(\mu h)^{\bar{l}+1}|\log h|^{\bar{l}+1-\bar{\sigma}}h^{-d}. \tag{0.26}$$

Corollary 0.4. *(i) For smooth operators the best remainder estimate*

$$\mathcal{R} \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} \tag{0.27}$$

holds as $\mu \le h^{\delta-1}$ *with arbitrarily small exponent* $\delta > 0$.
(ii) If $(l,\sigma) \succeq (3,1)$ *then asymptotics (0.27) holds for* $\mu \le Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.
(iii) For $\mu \le Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ *one can skip last term in estimates (0.25) – (0.26).*

[3)] $(l,\sigma) \succ (l',\sigma')$ if either $l > l'$ or $l = l'$,$\sigma > \sigma'$ etc.

0.4.3 Results: intermediate magnetic field

Our second statement deals with a stronger magnetic field:

Theorem 0.5. *Let conditions (0.2), (0.17), (0.20)-(0.23) with $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (l,\sigma) \succeq (1,2)$, $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (2,1)$ and condition 0.1 and (0.24) be fulfilled.*

Then for

$$\mu_1^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \mu \le \mu_2^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon' h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \tag{0.28}$$

with sufficiently small constant $\epsilon' > 0$ the following estimate holds:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big| \int \Big(\tilde{e}(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}(x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}_{\text{1corr}}(x,0)\Big)\psi(x)dx\Big| \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + C\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}h^{-d} \tag{0.29}$$

where formula for non-smoothness correction $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}_{\text{1corr}}$ is rather complicated and given in subsection 5.2.4 but one can take it 0 unless $l \ge 2$, $(l,\sigma) \prec (3,0)$ when it does not exceed $C\mu^{-2}(\mu h)^{l-2}h^{-d}|\log(\mu h)|^{-\sigma}$ (for $l > 2$).

Remark 0.6. (i) Condition (0.28) means exactly that estimate (0.29) is stronger than (0.25),(0.26).
(ii) If $(l,\sigma) \succeq (3,1)$ then the best remainder estimate (0.27) holds as $\mu \le \mu_2^*$.

0.4.4 Results: strong magnetic field

Theorem 0.7. *Let conditions (0.2), (0.17), (0.20)-(0.23) with $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (l,\sigma)$, $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (2,1)$ and Condition 0.1 and (0.24) be fulfilled.*

Let

$$\mu_2^* \le C\mu \le \mu_3^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon' h^{-1} \tag{0.30}$$

with sufficiently small constant $\epsilon' > 0$. Then

(i) If $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ then the following estimate holds:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + C(\mu^{-l}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log h|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma}h^{-d}; \tag{0.31}$$

in particular, for $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,1)$ remainder estimate $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d})$ holds. The description of $\mathcal{E}^{\text{MW}}_{\text{1corr}}$ is the same as in 0.5.

(ii) If $l > 2$ then estimate (0.27) holds.

(iii) If $\#\mathfrak{N} > 1$, $l \le 2$, then the following estimate holds:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} + C\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}h^{-d}e^{C_0\mu h|\log h|}. \tag{0.32}$$

Remark 0.8. (i) For $\#\mathfrak{N}=1$ estimate (0.31) remains valid under relaxed restriction to μ:

$$\mu_2^* \le C\mu \le \mu_3^{**} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Ch^{-1}. \tag{0.30$'$}$$

For $\mu \ge \mu_2^*$ one can replace Condition 0.1 by Condition 0.2.
(ii) If $F_k^j = \text{const}$ then $\#\mathfrak{N}=1$, microhyperbolicity condition is equivalent to (0.18) and one can skip condition (0.17).

0.4.5 Results: superstrong magnetic field

Now we need to consider case

$$\mu \ge \mu_3^{**} = \epsilon' h^{-1} \tag{0.33}$$

in which spectral gaps are possible. I will discuss them in the end.

In this case we need to modify our conditions. First of all one must assume that $\#\mathfrak{N}=1$ which will be covered by other conditions I impose.

Second, we need to replace (0.23) by

$$\exists \alpha = \bar\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r} : \ V + \sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)\mu h f_j \in C^{l,\sigma}. \tag{0.34}$$

Further we need to assume that one of the following conditions is fulfilled:

(0.35) $g^{jk} = \text{const}, F_{jk} = \text{const}$ and (0.19) holds

(0.36) α in (0.34) is unique (at each point):

$$\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}, \alpha \ne \bar\alpha \quad |\sum_j (\alpha_j - \bar\alpha_j) f_j| \ge \epsilon_0 > 0; \tag{0.37}$$

in the former case we impose microhyperbolicity condition (0.19); in the latter case we impose the following microhyperbolicity condition:

$$|\nabla\Big(V\big(\sum_j (2\bar\alpha_j+1) f_j\big)^{-1}\Big)| \ge \epsilon_0. \tag{0.38}$$

Theorem 0.9. *Let conditions (0.2), (0.20), (0.21)–(0.22), (0.34) with $(\bar l, \bar\sigma) \succeq (l,\sigma)$, $(\bar l, \bar\sigma) \succeq (2,1)$ and (0.24) be fulfilled.*

Finally, let <u>*either*</u> *conditions* (0.36), (*0.19*) <u>*or*</u> (*0.37*), (*0.38*) *be fulfilled. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Big|\int \Big(\tilde{e}(x,x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,0) - \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{2\mathrm{corr}}(x,0)\Big)\psi(x)dx\Big| \le \\ C\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r} + C\mu^r h^{-r}(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{l}{2}}|\log\mu|^{\frac{l}{2}-\sigma} + C\mu^{r+1}h^{1-r}(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{\bar{l}}{2}}|\log\mu|^{\frac{\bar{l}}{2}-\bar{\sigma}} \tag{0.39}$$

with

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{2\mathrm{corr}}(x,\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2\pi)^{-r}\mu^r h^{2-r}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r}} \delta\Big(\tau - \sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)f_j\mu h - V\Big)W' \tag{0.40}$$

with $W' = O(1)$ *(the exact formula is rather complicated).*

Finally, consider spectral gaps:

Theorem 0.10. *Let conditions* (*0.2*), (*0.20*), (*0.21*) – (*0.22*), (*0.34*) *with* $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (l,\sigma)$, $(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}) \succeq (2,1)$ *and* (*0.24*) *be fulfilled.*

Further, let either condition (0.36) *be fulfilled or* $\mu h \le C_1$. *Finally, let*

$$|\sum_i (2\alpha_i+1)\mu h + V| \ge \epsilon_1 \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{+r}. \tag{0.41}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{R} \le C\mu^{-s} \tag{0.42}$$

with arbitrarily large s.

Surely, microhyperbolic case of theorem 0.9 is separated from elliptic case of theorem 0.10 by degenerate one but we do not consider it (it is possible assuming that the degeneracy is not (very) degenerate (in the spirit of [Ivr8]).

0.5 Ideas of the proofs and the structure of the paper

To prove major theorems I follow scheme of [Ivr1, Ivr6]. Namely, first I replace operator A with its approximation $\tilde{A} = \tilde{A}_\varepsilon$ (actually I consider two framing approximations) and then analyze the cut-off spectral trace

$$\phi_\epsilon(hD_t)\bar{\chi}_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Big(e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde{A}}Q\Big) \tag{0.43}$$

with ϕ, $\bar{\chi}$ both supported in $[-1,1]$, $\bar{\chi} = 1$ in $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$ and $\bar{\chi}_T(t) = \bar{\chi}(t/T)$ etc; here Q is $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo cut-off.

Until 0.5.5 I will concentrate on the most difficult $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ case.

0.5.1 Weak magnetic field approach

First, I can introduce symbols $q_i = x_i - \sum_j \beta_{ij}(x)\xi_i$ such that $|\{\mu^2 a, q_i\}| \le C\mu^{-1}$ where $a^0 = \sum_{i,j} g^{ij}p_i p_j$, $p_i = \xi_i - V_i(x)$. This means that q_i evolve along Hamiltonian trajectories of $\mu^2 a + V$ with the speed not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}$ and for time $T \in (1, T_1)$, $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$, variation of q_i and thus of x_i does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}T$.

Then I prove that variation of (some) linear combination of them, $\sum_i \ell'_i q_i$, is exactly of magnitude $\mu^{-1}T$. To do this I apply microhyperbolicity condition and it would be basically the end if ℓ did not depend on $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Otherwise I need to consider an evolution of partial symbols $\mu^2 a^0_{\mathsf{m}}$ (see (0.11)). The trouble is that $|\{\mu^2 a, \mu^2 a^0_{\mathsf{m}}\}|$ is of magnitude 1 which means that *only* for time $T \le \epsilon$ in the classical evolution symbols $\mu^2 a^0_{\mathsf{m}}$ are close to their original values and I can use microhyperbolicity. This would imply remainder estimate no better than $O(h^{1-d})$.

Remark 0.11. All above results for week, intermediate and strong magnetic field remain true if we replace partition $\mathfrak{N}$ in Condition 0.1 by partition $\mathfrak{M}$ and add Ch^{1-d} to right-hand expression of all estimates.

To avoid this, I increase resonance groups to exclude intergroup third-order resonances; then $|\{\mu^2 a, \mu^2 a^0_{\mathsf{n}}\}|$ are of magnitude μ^{-1} for $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ and of magnitude $\mu^{1-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$ otherwise. This means that $\mu^2 a^0_{\mathsf{n}}$ keep close to their original values for time $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$ as $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ and $T_1 = \epsilon\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma}$ as $(l,\sigma) \prec (2,0)$. This explains where $\mathfrak{N}$ came from and the first term in the right-hand expression in (0.26).

Now, due to microhyperbolicity the shift in $\sum_i \ell'_i \eta_i$ is of magnitude exactly $\mu^{-1}T$ as $T \le T_1$. In order to have it microlocally observable we need it to satisfy logarithmic uncertainty principle

$$\mu^{-1}T \times \varepsilon \ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|. \tag{0.44}$$

Here ε is a scale with respect to x (remember, that q_i include ξ_j via p_j) and the right-hand expression is $C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$ because we actually have $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos. So, for $T \in [T_0, T_1]$, $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ we can prove that

$$\phi_\epsilon(hD_t)\chi_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Bigl(e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde{A}}Q\Bigr) \tag{0.45}$$

is negligible for χ supported in $[-1,-\frac{1}{2}]\cup[\frac{1}{2},1]$. Then construction of cut-off spectral trace (0.43) for $T = T_1$ is reduced to its construction for $T = T_0$ which requires analysis of the short-term evolution.

On the other hand, due to rescaling arguments we know (0.43) modulo negligible for $T_{\mathrm{st}} = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$. If $T_{\mathrm{st}} \ge T_0$ (which means exactly that $\varepsilon \ge C\mu h|\log h|$), we are done.

Picking $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ we prove both estimates (0.26), (0.27) of theorem 0.3: the first term in the right-hand expressions is a remainder estimate $Ch^{1-d}T_1^{-1}$ for mollified operator and the second term is an approximation error estimate.

This is done in section 1.

0.5.2 Canonical form

To consider a stronger magnetic field I need to reduce operator to a canonical form (kind of Birkhoff normal form). In contrast to 2-dimensional case resonances can appear and they are the real problem. Even in the smooth case removing "removable" fourth-order terms is not worth of trouble. Further, reduction involves Taylor decomposition with respect to p^α ($p = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$) and therefore each gained factor p_j costs us differentiation with respect to x which in turn leads to division by ε. Therefore in the heuristic sense I need $|p| \le \varepsilon$. But in the microlocal sense $|p| \asymp \mu^{-1}$ as $\mu \le h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and therefore I must take $\varepsilon \ge \mu^{-1}$ then.

Note that in 2-dimensional case I was able to take smaller $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ because instead of method of Taylor series I solved equation $\partial_\phi S = V - W$ along small circle (of radius $\asymp \mu^{-1}$) where W is an average of V along this circle. In multidimensional case we have instead of circle a more general cyclotron orbit $d\phi_j = f_j dt$ which can be closed or everywhere dense depending on the ratio of f_j; I was not able to repeat this trick in $2r$-dimensional case.

Further, in the general non-smooth $2r$-dimensional case without condition (0.22) I managed to make a reduction only in $C\varepsilon$-vicinity[4)] and it is not enough even if due to weak magnetic field approach one needs only short-range propagation.

Finally note that $\varepsilon = C\mu^{-1}$ is better than $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ as $\mu \ge \mu_1^*$. This explains that in order to derive sharp remainder estimate $O\bigl(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}\bigr)$ (for $\mu \le h^{-1}$) I need in multidimensional case more regularity of coefficients than in 2-dimensional one. All the analysis beyond one of 0.5.1 should be done for $\mu \ge \mu_1^*$ only.

Actual construction is done in section 2 by $\mu^{-1}h$-Fourier integral operators in the smooth case and their "poor man's" equivalent in the mollified non-smooth case.

0.5.3 Strong magnetic field: long range propagation

I can use week field method to prove that for $T_0 \le T \le T_1$ with $T_0 = Ch|\log h|\varepsilon^{-1}$ spectral trace (0.45) is negligible. In the intermediate magnetic field case it requires no modification.

In the strong magnetic field case $\mu_2^* = \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu_3^* = \epsilon h^{-1}$ one should take $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ exactly as in 2-dimensional case. Then no modification is needed as

[4)] Actually, one can increase it to ϵ-vicinity as $l \ge l(d)$ but it is too high price to pay.

well with the only exception: for $\#\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$ a very serious modification is needed in the part concerning localization of $\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}}$.

The problem is that $\varphi(\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1}, \dots, \mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{N}}})$ is not a proper symbol anymore (logarithmic uncertainty principle is violated) and this obstacle is not related to the smoothness. So, instead of "microlocal localization" $\bigl(\varphi(\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1}, \dots, \mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{N}}})\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}$ I consider "operator localization" $\varphi(\mu^2 a^{0\,\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_1}, \dots, \mu^2 a^{0\,\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{N}}})$ and it takes some efforts to prove that for time $t \in [-T_1, T_1]$ this operator (applied to u) is negligible provided it was negligible at at $t = 0$; here and below b^{w} is a Weyl quantization of symbol b. It requires to increase sightly ε:

$$\varepsilon \ge C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{C\mu h|\log h|}. \tag{0.46}$$

0.5.4 Short-range propagation

Still, interval $[-T_0, T_0]$ is too wide. It would be nice to confine analysis to much smaller interval $[-T_0^*, T_0^*]$ with $T_0^* = Ch|\log h|$ proving that (0.45) is negligible for $T \in [T_0^*, T_0]$ (actually one needs a bit more). Unfortunately it is not possible unless l is very large; I prove instead that (0.45) does not exceed $Ch^{-d}(h/T)^l|\log(h/T)|^{-\sigma}$. This statement implies immediately that for $(l, \sigma) \succ (1, 1)$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\phi_\epsilon(hD_t)\bar\chi_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Bigl(e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde A}Q\Bigr)| \le Ch^{1-d} \tag{0.47}$$

which immediately implies (due to Tauberian method) remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d}T_1^{-1})$ for mollified operator in this case (but there will be still mollification error).

0.5.5 Calculations

So far, even if I recovered proper remainder estimates, the principal part of asymptotics is given by the same Tauberian method:

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Bigl(e^{ih^{-1}t\tilde A}\psi\Bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau \tag{0.48}$$

with $T = T_1$ or $T = T_0$ due to negligibility of their difference.

For weak magnetic field I had a standard expression due to standard results rescaled.

In all other cases to get an explicit expression for the principal part of asymptotics I calculate u by a method of successive approximations on interval $[-T_0, T_0]$ applied to the reduced operator. This is done in section 5.

0.5.6 Superstrong magnetic field

This is completely different case. One needs to assume that $\#\mathfrak{N}=1$ here because arguments of 0.5.3 do not work anymore. Then the previous methods still work for $\mu\le \mu_3^{**}=Ch^{-1}$.

For $\mu\ge \mu_3^{**}$ one needs to impose one of conditions (0.35),(0.36). So, I need to consider two different situations:

(i) g^{jk}, F_{jk} *are constant*. Then making a reduction in ϵ-vicinity and applying decomposition of the transformed u with respect to Hermite functions

$$u_{\text{transformed}}(x,y,t)=\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r}} u_{\alpha,\beta}(x'',y'',t)\upsilon_\alpha\bigl(\mu^{\frac12}h^{-\frac12}x'\bigr)\upsilon_\beta\bigl(\mu^{\frac12}h^{-\frac12}y'\bigr) \tag{0.49}$$

we see that $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfy a system

$$\Bigl(hD_t-B_\alpha(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\Bigr)u_{\alpha,\beta}=\sum_\gamma b_{\alpha,\gamma}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')u_{\gamma,\beta} \tag{0.50}$$

with initial data

$$u_{\alpha,\beta}=\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta(x''-y'') \tag{0.51}$$

where $B_\alpha=\sum_j 2(\alpha_j+1)f_j^{\mathrm{w}}\mu h-V^{\mathrm{w}}$ (actually one needs to transform f_j and V first) and intertwining operators $b_{\alpha\beta}$ are rather small.

Similar system holds with respect to β, y'', t.

Then unless

$$|\sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)f_j\mu h+V|\le \epsilon \tag{0.52}$$

operators $\bigl(hD_t-B_\alpha(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\bigr)$ are elliptic at energy levels τ close to 0. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a (finite) set of indices satisfying (0.52). Then expressing $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\alpha\notin\mathfrak{A}$ via $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\alpha\in\mathfrak{A}$ and (doing the same for $u_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\beta\notin\mathfrak{A}$) I reduce the original system to a system for $\mathcal{U}=(u_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{A},\beta\in\mathfrak{A}}$ which is analyzed in a standard way.

(ii) *Condition* (0.36) *holds*. Then $\mathfrak{A}=\{\bar\alpha\}$. In this case I can reduce everything to just one equation.

0.5.7 Some references and future plans

The asymptotics with the principal part $(0.4)^*$ but without any remainder estimate was derived by G.Raikov in [Rai1, Rai2, Rai3, Rai4, Rai5].

Sharp spectral asymptotics in the superstrong magnetic field case (smooth) was derived by M.Dimassi in in [Dim].

In forthcoming papers I consider operators with magnetic field intensity matrices having incomplete constant ranks $2r$. The typical example (already studied in [Ivr1, Ivr6]) is 3-dimensional magnetic Schrödinger operator. Canonic form of such operators contains "free" $d-2r$-dimensional h-differential Schrödinger operator. On one hand, this means that the remainder estimate could be only h times "better" than the principal part (while now it is $\mu^{-1}h$ times "better"). On the other hand, such operators require weaker smoothness and non-degeneracy assumptions. Under assumptions, similar to assumptions of this paper I am going to derive asymptotics with the principal part $\asymp (h^{-d}+\mu^r h^{-d+r})$ and with the sharp remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d}+\mu^r h^{1-d+r})$ as $(l,\sigma)\succ(1,2)$; further, under condition (0.35) for $d-2r\ge 3$ and for $d-2r=2, (l,\sigma)\succ(2,0)$ no non-degeneracy condition will be needed. Surely, only case $d-2r=1$ is generic.

Later I hope to be able to consider (F_{jk}) of variable rank but remainder estimates will probably deteriorate. I also plan to consider Dirac operators with the strong magnetic field (as in Chapter 7 of [Ivr1]).

1 Weak magnetic field

As I mentioned, in the weak magnetic field we consider original (x,ξ) coordinates. As I explained we can take x-scale

$$\varepsilon \ge C\mu h|\log h|. \tag{1.1}$$

and therefore to satisfy logarithmic uncertainty principle we can take ξ-scale μ^{-1}. By no means this is larger than $C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ needed to consider $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with symbol smooth in ε-scale in both x and ξ and therefore we cannot make a reduction here; only some kind of quasireduction[5)].

1.1 Heuristics. I. Classical propagation

Here I am interested in classical dynamics generated by symbol $\mu^2 a^0 + V$ with

$$a^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j,k} g^{jk} p_j p_k, \qquad p_j = \mu^{-1}\xi_j - V_j(x) \tag{1.2}$$

[5)] As in [Ivr6] in case the of weak magnetic field it is possible.

at energy levels close to 0 for time $t : |t| \le T_1$ with $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$. On energy levels below c_0 we have

$$|p_j| \le C\mu^{-1}. \tag{1.3}$$

At this heuristic stage I will not look at the smoothness (thus assuming that l is large enough).

First of al we can find $f_{jk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ such that for $q_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_j - \sum_k f_{jk}(x)p_k$

$$\{p_m, q_j\} = O(\mu^{-2}). \tag{1.4}$$

Really,

$$\{p_m, p_k\} = \mu^{-1}F_{km} \tag{1.5}$$

and therefore $\{p_m, q_j\} = \mu^{-1}\delta_{mj} - \mu^{-1}\sum_{j,k} f_{jk}F_{km}$ and one needs to take $(f_{jk}) = (F_{jk})^{-1}$.

Then one can see easily that

$$\{q_j, q_k\} \equiv \{x_j, q_k\} \equiv \mu^{-1}f_{jk} \qquad \mod O(\mu^{-2}) \tag{1.6}$$

and therefore

$$\mu^2\{a^0, q_j\} = O(\mu^{-1}), \quad \{V, q_j\} = O(\mu^{-1}) \tag{1.7}$$

which implies that

(1.8) *In classical evolution at energy levels below c_0 for time $t : |t| \le \epsilon\mu$ increment of Q_j does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}|t| \le \epsilon_1$;*

(1.9) *In classical evolution at energy levels below c_0 for time $t : |t| \le \epsilon\mu$ increment of x_j does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}(|t|+1) \le \epsilon_1$.*

One can see easily that in the case of constant g^{jk}, F_{jk}

$$\mu^2\{a^0, q_j\} = 0, \quad \{V, q_j\} = \mu^{-1}\sum_k f_{jk}\partial_k V \tag{1.7$'$}$$

and therefore

(1.10) *In the case of constant g^{jk}, F_{jk} the classical evolution for time $t : |t| \le \epsilon\mu$ is approximately described by equation*[6)]

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_j = \mu^{-1}\sum_k f_{jk}\partial_k V \tag{1.11}$$

[6)] This equation describes approximately coordinates x_j but *not* velocities.

along which V is preserved.

To describe evolution more precisely in the general case let us consider a point $\bar{x}$. I remind that then $\mathfrak{M}(\bar{x})$ is a partition of $\{1,\dots,r\}$ such that $|(f_i-f_j)(\bar{x})|\le\epsilon$ iff i,j belong to the same element $\mathfrak{m}$ of this partition.

Then we can introduce

$$\zeta_j(x,\xi)=\sum_{1\le k\le 2r}\alpha_{jk}(x)p_k(x,\xi),\qquad j=1,\dots,r \tag{1.12}$$

with complex coefficients $\alpha_{jk}\in\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ such that

$$\{\zeta_j,\zeta_k\}=0,\quad \{\zeta_j^\dagger,\zeta_k\}=2i\mu^{-1}\delta_{jk}\qquad \text{at } \Sigma^0\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\bigl\{(x,\xi),p_1=\dots=p_{2r}=0\bigr\} \tag{1.13}$$

where I remind that † means complex conjugation,

$$\{\zeta_j,\zeta_k\}\equiv 0,\quad \{\zeta_j^\dagger,\zeta_k\}\equiv 2i\mu^{-1}\delta_{jk}\qquad \mod O(\mu^{-2})\qquad \text{as } |p|\le c\mu^{-1} \tag{1.14}$$

and

$$a^0=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mathfrak{m}}\sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}}a_{jk}(x)\zeta_j^\dagger(x,\xi)\zeta_k(x,\xi) \tag{1.15}$$

with Hermitian matrices $(a_{jk})_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}}$ close to a scalar matrices $f_{\mathfrak{m}}I_{\#\mathfrak{m}}$ of the same dimensions.

Note that Σ^0 is a symplectic manifold and $\mathbb{R}^d\ni x$ inherits its symplectic form, a volume form, and Hamiltonian field (we call it "Liouvillian field") respectively:

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k}F_{jk}\,dx_j\wedge dx_k, \tag{1.16}$$

$$|\det F|^{\frac{1}{2}}\,dx_1\wedge\dots\wedge dx_d=f_1\cdots f_r\sqrt{g}dx, \tag{1.17}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi=-\sum_{j,k}f_{jk}(\partial_j\phi)\partial_k. \tag{1.18}$$

Note also that

$$a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}}b_{jk}(x)\zeta_j^\dagger(x,\xi)\zeta_k(x,\xi) \tag{1.19}$$

satisfy $\mu^2\{a^0,a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}\}=O(1)$, $\{V,a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}\}=O(1)$ so the increment of $\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}$ for time t does not exceed $C|t|$ and thus $\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are moderate but not slow variables (and their increment for $t=T_1$ could be rather large.

Now we can replace ζ_j by

$$\zeta_{j\ \mathrm{new}} = \zeta_j - \sum_{kl} \beta_{jkm}(x)\eta_k\eta_m \tag{1.20}$$

with $\beta_{jkm} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$ to make

$$\{\zeta_j, \zeta_k\} \equiv 0, \quad \{\zeta_j^\dagger, \zeta_k\} \equiv 2i\mu^{-1}\delta_{jk} \qquad \mod O(\mu^{-3}) \tag{1.21}$$

where for the sake of simplicity we use notations $\eta_{2k-1} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \operatorname{Re}\zeta_k$, $\eta_{2k} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \operatorname{Im}\zeta_k$, $k = 1, \dots, r$.

Then

$$\mu^2 a^0 = \frac{1}{2}\mu^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{m}} \sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}(q)\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k + \frac{1}{3}\mu^2 \sum_{j,k,m} a_{jkl}\,\eta_j\eta_k\eta_m + \dots, \tag{1.22}$$

$$V = V(q) + \sum_j a_j(q)p_j + \dots \tag{1.23}$$

where dots denote terms with $O(\mu^{-1})$ gradients.

These cubic terms in (1.22) and linear terms in (1.23) are the only sources of trouble because Poisson brackets $\mu^4\{\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{m}}, \bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{m}'}\} = O(\mu^{-1})$ and $\mu^2\{\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{m}}, V(q)\} = O(\mu^{-1})$ where $\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{m}}$ are defined by (1.19) with $a_{jk}(x)$ replaced by $a_{jk}(q)$.

To get rid of these terms we can redefine ζ_j again replacing them by $\zeta_j + \{S, \zeta_j\}$ with

$$S = \mu \sum_{k,m,n} \gamma_{kmn}\eta_k\eta_m\eta_n + \mu^{-1}\sum_m \gamma_m\eta_m. \tag{1.24}$$

This replacement preserves (1.13),(1.14),(1.18) and modulo terms with $O(\mu^{-1})$ gradients) it is equivalent to the replacement of $\mu^2 a_0 + V$ by

$$\mu^2 a_0 + V + \{S, \mu^2 a_0 + V\} \equiv \mu^2 a_0 + V + \mu^2\{S, a_0 V\}.$$

We can always choose γ_j killing a_j and if there is no third order resonances we can choose γ_{jkm} killing a_{jkm}; in the general case we can reduce $\mu^2 a_0 + V$ to

$$\mu^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{m}} \bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{m}} + \mu^2 \operatorname{Re}\sum_{\mathfrak{n}} \sum_{j,k,m\in\mathfrak{n}} a_{jkm}(q)\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k\zeta_m + V(q) \tag{1.25}$$

where $\mathfrak{n}$ denote third order resonance groups (see Introduction).

Then, introducing

$$\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{n}} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathfrak{m}\subset\mathfrak{n}} \bar{a}_{\mathfrak{m}} + \operatorname{Re}\sum_{j,k,m\in\mathfrak{n}} a_{jkm}(q)\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k\zeta_m \tag{1.26}$$

we see that $\mu^4\{\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{n}}, \bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{n}'}\} = O(\mu^{-1})$ and $\mu^2\{\bar{a}^0_{\mathfrak{n}}, V(q)\} = O(\mu^{-1})$ and therefore

(1.27) *In classical evolution at energy levels below c_0 for time $t : |t| \le \epsilon\mu$ increment of $\bar{a}_{\mathfrak{n}}$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}|t| \le \epsilon_1$;*

(1.28) *In classical evolution at energy levels below c_0 for time $t : |t| \le \epsilon\mu$ increment of $a^0_{\mathfrak{n}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathfrak{m}\subset\mathfrak{n}} a^0_{\mathfrak{m}}$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}(|t|+1) \le \epsilon_1$.*

It follows from (1.6) that

$$\{q_j, q_k\} \equiv \mu^{-1} f_{jk}(q) + O(\mu^{-2}) \tag{1.6$'$}$$

and then one can reintroduce $q_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_j - \sum_k f_{jk}(x)\eta_k - \sum_{k,m} \rho_{jkm}(x)\eta_k\eta_m$ to make

$$\{\eta_k, q_j\} = O(\mu^{-3}). \tag{1.29}$$

Then

$$\{\mu^2 a^0 + V, q_j\} \equiv \mu^2 \sum_{k,m} \{a_{km}, q_j\}\zeta_k\zeta_m^\dagger + \{V(q), q_j\} \mod O(\mu^{-3}) \tag{1.30}$$

and microhyperbolicity condition (0.15) means exactly that

(1.31) $\{\mu^2 a^0 + V, \sum_j \ell_j q_j\} \ge \epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$ as $|x - \bar{x}| \le \epsilon$, $|\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}} - \tau_{\mathfrak{n}}| \le \epsilon$ and $|\mu^2 a^0 + V| \le \epsilon$.

Thus, $\sum_j \ell_j q_j$ will really increase with the rate $\asymp \mu^{-1}$ for time $|t| \le T_1 = \epsilon\mu$.

1.2 Heuristics. II. Classical propagation

Now I would like to consider what happens for not very large smoothness.

First of all, all our analysis obviously holds as $(l, \sigma) \succeq (2, 0)$.

Furthermore, as long as we do not need to analyze $a^0_{\mathfrak{n}}$ (i.e. if we have $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ in the microhyperbolicity condition) C^1-smoothness is sufficient: to estimate by $O(\mu^{-1})$ the rate of change of q we need to have only $\{\zeta_j, q_k\} = O(\mu^{-2})$ and $\{x_j, q_k\} = O(\mu^{-1})$. With microhyperbolicity we need $\{\zeta_j, q_k\} = o(\mu^{-2})$ and calculation of $\{x_j, q_k\}$ modulo $o(\mu^{-1})$. To do it we just need to mollify C-coefficients ρ_{jkm} with the mollification parameter $o(1)$.

If $(l, \sigma) \preceq (2, 0)$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} > 1$ in the microhyperbolicity condition, we need to analyze evolution of $a^0_{\mathfrak{n}}$. One can see easily that

$$\{\mu^2 a^0 + f, \mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}}\} = O(\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}) \tag{1.32}$$

because one can consider third-order and linear terms and replace them by their μ^{-1}-mollifications with respect to η and Q; then for mollified terms this estimate would hold

and for mollification error it would hold as well since the gradient of the error would be $O(\mu^{1-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma})$.

Therefore one can take

$$T_1 = \epsilon\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma} \tag{1.33}$$

and in the end of the day semiclassical error will be $Ch^{1-d}T_1^{-1}$ which is exactly the first term in estimate (0.26).

1.3 Semiclassical propagation

Now moving from classical dynamics to rigorous analysis I prove few statements, assuming that

$$\mu_0 \le \mu \le \mu_2^* = \epsilon_1 h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}, \tag{1.34}$$

$$\varepsilon \ge Ch|\log h| \tag{1.35}$$

where here and below μ_0, C are large enough constants, and ϵ_k are small enough constants.

Proposition 1.1. [7] *Let $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$* [8] *and let*

$$M \ge \sup_{\sum_{jk} g^{jk}\xi_j\xi_k + V = 0} 2\sum_k g^{jk}\xi_k + \epsilon \tag{1.36}$$

with arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$.

Let ϕ_1 be supported in $B(0,1)$, $\phi_2 = 1$ in $B(0,2)$, χ be supported in $[-1,1]$ [9]*. Let $\bar{T}_0 = Ch|\log h| \le T \le T_1' = \epsilon_0$.*

Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\big(1-\phi_{2,MT}(x-\bar{x})\big)\phi_{1,MT}(y-\bar{x})u(x,y,t)| \le Ch^s \qquad \forall \tau \le \epsilon_1 \tag{1.37}$$

where here and below $\epsilon_1 > 0$ is a small enough constant.

Proposition 1.2. [10] *Let condition (0.2) be fulfilled. Let*

$$T_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h| + C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le T \le T_1 = \epsilon_0\mu. \tag{1.38}$$

[7] Finite speed of propagation with respect to x; cf Proposition 2.1 [Ivr6].

[8] Lower bound condition is not needed in this statement.

[9] I remind that all such auxiliary functions are appropriate in the sense of [BrIvr].

[10] Magnetic propagation; cf Proposition 2.2 (i) [Ivr6].

Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(1-\phi_{2,\mu^{-1}MT}(q_1-\bar{x}_1,\dots,q_d-\bar{x}_d)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}_x\times u(x,y,t)\bigl(\phi_{1,\mu^{-1}MT}(q_1-\bar{x}_1,\dots,q_d-\bar{x}_d)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}\,t}_y|\le Ch^s \qquad \forall\tau:|\tau|\le\epsilon_1 \tag{1.39}$$

where here and below $\mu_0>0$, C_1, M are large enough constants. Here and b^{w} means Weyl $\mu^{-1}h$-quantization of symbol b and due to condition (1.38) logarithmic uncertainty principle holds and this quantization of the symbols involved is justified, B^t means dual operator;

(ii) In particular, for $T\ge C_1$ this inequality holds for $q_1,\dots,q_d$ replaced by $x_1,\dots,x_d$.

Proposition 1.3. [11] *Let $\nu=\#\mathfrak{N}>2$. Let*

$$T_1=\epsilon v^{-1},\qquad v=\begin{cases} C\mu^{-1} & \text{for } (l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0),\\ C\mu^{1-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma} & \text{for } (l,\sigma)\preceq(2,0)\end{cases} \tag{1.40}$$

and

$$T_0\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}Cv^{-1}(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac12}\le T_1. \tag{1.41}$$

Let ϕ_j be functions as before. Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\bigl(1-\phi_{2,vT}(\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1}-\tau_1,\dots,\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu}-\tau_\nu)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}}\times \times u(x,y,t)\bigl(\phi_{1,vT}(\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1}-\tau_1,\dots,\mu^2a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu}-\tau_\nu)\bigr)^{\mathrm{w}\,t}_y|\le Ch^s \qquad \forall\tau,|\tau|\le\epsilon_1. \tag{1.42}$$

All propositions 1.1–1.3 are proven by the same scheme as in [Ivr6]:

To prove finite speed with respect to x one can use function

$$\varpi\Bigl(\bigl(\frac{|x-\bar{x}|^2}{T^2}+\epsilon^2\bigr)^{\frac12}-C\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Bigr) \tag{1.43}$$

with ϖ function of the same type as used in theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr], $\varsigma=\pm1$ depending on time direction and arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon>0$.

To prove that speed with respect to Q does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}$ one can use function

$$\varpi\Bigl(\bigl(\frac{\mu^2|q-\bar{q}|^2}{T^2}+\epsilon^2\bigr)^{\frac12}-C\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Bigr). \tag{1.44}$$

To prove that speed with respect to $a_{\mathfrak{n}}$ does not exceed v given by (1.40) one can use function

$$\varpi\Bigl(\bigl(\frac{\mu^4\sum_j|a_{\mathfrak{n}_j}-\tau_{\mathfrak{n}_j}|^2}{v^2T^2}+\epsilon^2\bigr)^{\frac12}-C\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Bigr). \tag{1.45}$$

[11] Evolution in $a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1},\dots,a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu}$; no 2-dimensional counter-part.

Proposition 1.4. [12] *Let $(l,\sigma)\succeq(1,2)$, microhyperbolicity condition be fulfilled and*

$$\mu_0\le\mu\le\epsilon_1 h^{-\frac12}|\log h|^{-\frac12}, \tag{1.46}$$

$$\varepsilon = C'\mu h|\log h|, \tag{1.47}$$

$$T_0=\epsilon\mu^{-1} \tag{1.48}$$

where large enough constant C' is chosen in the very last moment. Let us define

$$T_1=\epsilon\mu \qquad \text{if either } (l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0) \text{ or } \#\mathfrak{N}=1. \tag{1.49}$$

$$T_1=\epsilon\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma} \qquad \text{if } (l,\sigma)\prec(2,0) \text{ and } \#\mathfrak{N}>1. \tag{1.50}$$

Then for $T\in[T_0,T_1]$, $\tau\in[-\epsilon_1,\epsilon_1]$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\psi u|\le Ch^s. \tag{1.51}$$

Proof. (I) Let us first try function

$$\varpi\Big(\frac{\mu}{T}\langle\ell,q-\bar q\rangle+\epsilon\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Big) \tag{1.52}$$

with $\ell=\ell(y;\tau_1,\dots,\tau_\nu)$. One can check easily that it is an admissible symbol as long as $T\ge T_0=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$, $\mu\le\epsilon_3h^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{-\frac13}$ and scales with respect to x, ξ are $\gamma=\varepsilon\le\mu^{-1}T$ and $\rho=\mu^{-2}\le\mu^{-1}T$ respectively; then $\rho\gamma\ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|$.

Then our standard analysis (like in theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr], together with propositions 1.1–1.3 imply estimate (1.51).

(II) Now let us consider case $\epsilon_3h^{-\frac13}|\log h|^{-\frac13}\le\mu\le\epsilon_1h^{-\frac12}|\log h|^{-\frac12}$ and $\epsilon\mu^{-1}\le T\le C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$; then

$$\varepsilon\ge C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}\ge\mu^{-1}T, \tag{1.53}$$

function (1.52) is not necessarily admissible symbol and one needs a bit more delicate arguments.

Let us consider small vicinity of y. Without any loss of the generality one can assume that $f_{jk}(y)=0$ as $|j-k|\ne r$ (otherwise one can achieve it by a rotation). After this, without any loss of the generality one can assume that $\ell=(\ell',0)$ where $x'=(x_1,\dots,x_r)$, $x''=(x_{r+1},\dots,x_{2r})$ etc.

[12] Weak magnetic field case.

I remind that due to definition $q_j = x_j - \sum_k f_{jk}p_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,k}\beta_{jik}p_ip_k$, where β_{jik} are (mollified) coefficients chosen to eliminate linear with respect to $(p_1,\dots,p_d)$ terms in $\{p_k,q_j\}$. Consider function

$$\varpi\Big(\frac{\mu}{T}\langle \ell, q-\bar{q}\rangle + \epsilon\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Big) = \varpi\Big(\frac{\mu}{T}\big(\langle \ell', x-\bar{x}'\rangle - \sum_{j,k}\ell_j f_{jk}p_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j,k}\ell_j\beta_{jik}p_ip_k\big)\Big) \tag{1.54}$$

and use a vector scale $(\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\rho})$ with respect to (x,ξ) with

$$\rho_j\gamma_j \ge C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|. \tag{1.55}$$

Consider the first derivatives of the argument of ϖ; we want them to be bounded after rescaling. We take $\gamma_j=\gamma$, $\rho_j=\rho$ as $j\le r$ and $\gamma_j=\rho$, $\rho_j=\gamma$ as $j>r$ with $\rho\ge\gamma$; then $|f_{jk}-f_{jk}(y)|\le c\rho$.

Note that to have first derivatives with respect to x' bounded by $C_0\gamma^{-1}$ one needs to take $\gamma=\mu^{-1}T$ [13] as $j\le r$. Further to have first derivatives with respect to ξ' bounded by $C_0\rho^{-1}$ one needs to take $\rho=(\mu^{-1}T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as $j\le r$. Then first derivatives with respect to ξ'' are also bounded by $C_0\gamma^{-1}$ and to have first derivatives with respect to x'' bounded by $C_0\rho^{-1}$ one needs to have $|\partial_j p_k|\le c\rho$ as $j\le r$, $k=j+r$; this could be achieved by gauge transformation.

To satisfy (1.55) one needs then

$$T \ge C\mu(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{2}{3}}; \tag{1.56}$$

one can see easily that $T=T_0=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$ fits if and only if μ satisfies (1.46). Then picking up $\gamma=\min\Big(C\mu h|\log h|, C\mu^{-1}T\Big)$ and $\rho=\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we see that (1.55) holds and (1.54) is an admissible symbol.

Then our standard analysis (like in theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr], together with propositions 1.1–1.3 imply estimate (1.51). □

Applying the same methods as above in the cases $T\ge C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $T\le C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ respectively we can prove easily

Proposition 1.5. [14] *Let $(l,\sigma)\succeq(1,2)$, microhyperbolicity condition be fulfilled and*

$$\epsilon_1 h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}, \tag{1.57}$$

$$C'(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \varepsilon \le C'\mu h|\log h|, \tag{1.58}$$

$$T_0 = Ch|\log h|\cdot\max\Big(\varepsilon^{-1},(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{-\frac{1}{3}}\Big) \tag{1.59}$$

[13] Or less; we always take the maximal value.

[14] Weak magnetic field approach.

where large enough constant C' is chosen in the very last moment. Let us define T_1 by (1.47)–(1.48).

Then for $T \in [T_0, T_1]$, $\tau \in [-\epsilon_1, \epsilon_1]$ estimate (1.51) holds.

Corollary 1.6. *In frames of proposition 1.4, 1.5*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar\chi_T(t) - \bar\chi_{T_0}(t)\bigr)\Gamma\psi u| \le Ch^s \tag{1.60}$$

where I remind that $\bar\chi$ is admissible function supported in $[-1,1]$ and equal 1 at $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$.

1.4 Weak magnetic field: conclusion

Since in frames of proposition 1.4 $T_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ and rescaling $x \mapsto \mu x$, $\varepsilon \mapsto \mu\varepsilon$, $t \mapsto \mu t$, $h \mapsto \mu h$, $T_0 \mapsto \epsilon$ leads to a standard Schrödiinger (i.e. with $\mu = 1$), we can apply standard methods. Then

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma\psi u| \le Ch^{1-d} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon \tag{1.61}$$

and applying Tauberian arguments we conclude immediately that

$$|\Gamma(\psi\tilde e)(\tau) - h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bar\chi_T(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\Bigr)\,d\tau'| \le CT_1^{-1}h^{1-d} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon \tag{1.62}$$

with any $T \in [T_0, T_1]$.

Now we need to calculate

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bar\chi_{T_0}(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\Bigr)\,d\tau'. \tag{1.63}$$

Using rescaling to standard Schrödinger operator we get that it is equal to

$$\sum_{m,n\ge 0}\kappa_{nm}h^{-d+2m+2n}\mu^{2n} \tag{1.64}$$

(the rest of the coefficients vanishes). Taking only term $\kappa_{00}h^{-d}$ we get standard Weyl expression $\int \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{W}}(\tau,x)\psi(x)\,dx$ with an error $O(\mu^2h^{2-d})$ which is $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d})$ as $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Taking only terms $\kappa_{00}h^{-d}+\kappa_{10}h^{2-d}\mu^2$ we commit error $O(h^{2-d}+\mu^4h^{4-d})$ which is $O(\mu^{-1}h^{1-d})$ as $\mu \le h^{-\frac{3}{5}}$. One can calculate this correction term $\kappa_{10}h^{2-d}\mu^2$ easily. Instead let us notice that $\kappa_{n0} = \int \varkappa_{n0}(x,\tau)\psi(x)\,dx$ where $\varkappa_{10}(x,\tau)$ depends only on g^{jk}, V and $\partial_k V_j$ calculated

at point x, and thus with indicated error to calculate (1.63) with Γ_y instead of Γ and with $\psi = 1$ and one can consider Schrödinger operator

$$\bar{A} = \sum_{j,k} \bar{g}^{jk} \bar{P}_j \bar{P}_k + \bar{V}, \qquad \bar{g}^{jk} = g^{jk}(y), \bar{V} = V(y), \tag{1.65}$$

$$\bar{P}_j = hD_j - V_j(y) - \sum_k (\partial_k V_j)(y)(x_k - y_k)$$

and for this operator expression in question is exactly $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(y,\tau)$.

So, we have proven

$$|\Gamma(\psi\tilde{e})\tau) - \int \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\psi(x)\,dx| \le CT_1^{-1}h^{1-d} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon \tag{1.66}$$

where for $\mu \le Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ one can replace $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{MW}}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathrm{W}}$. Thus

Corollary 1.7. *Theorem 0.3 is proven under condition (1.46).*

The case of weak magnetic field is completed. In the case of intermediate magnetic field (as in proposition 1.5) I need to consider evolution until time $T_0 \le \epsilon_0 \mu h|\log h|$ and according to proposition 1.2 evolution is confined to $C\mu^{-1}$-vicinity of the original point. According to (weaken) proposition 1.3 evolution in $(a^0_{\mathfrak{m}_j})_j = 1, \dots, p$ is confined to ϵ_1-vicinity of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. Here we can use finer partition $\mathfrak{M}$ rather than $\mathfrak{N}$ (because of the shorter interval).

1.5 Propagation. Strong magnetic field

Assume now that

$$\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le C_0 h^{-1}, \tag{1.67}$$

$$\varepsilon \ge (C\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{1.68}$$

In this case microlocally $|p| \le C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ rather than $|p| \le C\mu^{-1}$ even if $\varepsilon = 1$; because of this statements of the previous subsection should be modified:

Proposition 1.8. *Under conditions (1.67)–(1.68) statement of proposition 1.1 remains true with $M = C\mu h|\log h|$.*

Proposition 1.9. *Under conditions (1.67)–(1.68) both statements (i),(ii) of proposition 1.2 remain true.*

So far $T_0 = C_0 muh|\log\mu|$ and $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$.

If $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ the same arguments are sufficient to prove that $\chi_T(t)\Gamma u Q_y^\dagger \equiv 0$ for $T \in [T_0, T_1]$:

Proposition 1.10. *Let $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$. Then under conditions (1.67)–(1.68) statement of proposition 1.5 remains true.*

However, for $\nu = \#\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$ one needs to consider evolution of $a_{\mathfrak{n}}$ and the main trouble is that we can microlocalize $\mu^2 a_{\mathfrak{n}}$ only in the box of size $\mu^2\varepsilon^2 \asymp \mu h|\log h|$ which is by no means smaller than ϵ. We need instead *operator localization*: something like

$$\|\bar\chi_\epsilon\Big((\mu^2 a^{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_1} - \tau_{\mathfrak{n}_1}, \dots, (\mu^2 a^{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu} - \tau_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu})\Big)\psi(x)u\| \le Ch^s \tag{1.69}$$

as $|t| \le T$ where $\bar\chi$ is our standard cut-off function and constant ϵ could be taken sufficiently small (depending on the constant in microhyperbolicity condition).

To do this we will need to consider something like $\bar\chi(B)$ with B a linear combination with positive coefficients of $(\mu^2 a^{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_1} - \tau_{\mathfrak{n}_1}, \dots, (\mu^2 a^{\mathrm{w}}_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu} - \tau_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu})$. Then

$$\mu^{-2} b(x,\xi) = f(x,p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}\sum b_{jk}p_jp_k + \frac{1}{3}\sum b_{ijk}p_ip_jp_k + \mu^{-2}b_0 + \mu^{-2}\sum b_jp_j. \tag{1.70}$$

Last two terms are barely in the principal part.

We want to know how it evolves under propagator $e^{-i\mu h^{-1}tA}$ with $|t| \le \epsilon_2$. Note that $\phi(B) = \int e^{-i\tau B}\hat\phi(\tau)\,dz$ where $\hat\phi$ is a Fourier transform and therefore we need to consider evolution of A under $e^{-i\tau B}$ propagation.

This is much shorter evolution because instead of $t : |t| \le \epsilon_2$ we should consider $\tau : |\tau| \le C_s|\log h|$ since we can take $|\hat\phi(\tau)| \le Ch^s$ otherwise. Since $B = \mu h^{-1}\cdot\mu h\cdot\mu^{-2}B$ where $\mu^{-2}B$ is a standard $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo, we have a standard evolution now with just a bit larger time than the standard one: with time $C\mu h|\log h|$ instead of C.

Let us write down corresponding classical evolution for symbol b:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}x_j = \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j}, \tag{1.71}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}p_j = \sum_k \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_k}\{p_k, p_j\} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j} \tag{1.72}$$

where

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} = \sum_k b_{jk}p_k + O\big(|p|^2 + \mu^{-2}\big), \tag{1.73}$$

$$\sum_k \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_k}\{p_k, p_j\} = \sum_k \Lambda_{jk}p_k + O\big(|p|^2 + \mu^{-2}\big) \tag{1.74}$$

and $\Lambda_{jk} = \sum_i b_{ik}\{p_k, p_j\}$ is a matrix which is equivalent (in some metrics) to skew-symmetric and non-degenerate.

Differentiating with respect to initial data $z = (x,p)|_{\tau=0}$ we get

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}x_j^{(\alpha)} = \sum_j b_{mj}p_j^{(\alpha)} + \sum_{\beta<\alpha}\frac{\alpha!}{\beta!(\alpha-\beta)!}\sum_j (b_{mj})^{(\alpha-\beta)}p_j^{(\beta)} + \Big(\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} - \sum_k b_{kj}p_k\Big)^{(\alpha)}, \tag{1.75}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}p_j^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{ik} \Lambda_{jk}p_k^{(\alpha)} + \sum_{\beta<\alpha}\frac{\alpha!}{\beta!(\alpha-\beta)!}\sum_j (\Lambda_{jk})^{(\alpha-\beta)}p_j^{(\beta)} + \Big(\sum_k \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_k}\{p_k, p_j\} - \sum_k \Lambda_{jk}p_k - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\Big)^{(\alpha)}, \tag{1.76}$$

where $k^{(\alpha)} = \partial_z^\alpha k$ and $\beta < \alpha$ means that $\beta_j \le \alpha_j$ for all j and $\beta \ne \alpha$.

Condition 1.11. Let us assume that[15)]

$$|\partial_x^\alpha b_{jk}| \le C_0^{1+|\alpha|}\varepsilon^{\bar l - |\alpha|}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + C_0 \qquad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| \le N = \epsilon_0|\log\varepsilon| \tag{1.77}$$

and the same estimates hold for F_{jk}; then this estimate with $(\bar l - 1)$ instead of $\bar l$ holds for b_{ijk}.

Further, let us assume that this estimate with l instead of $\bar l$ holds for b_0; then this estimate with $(l-1)$ instead of $\bar l$ holds for b_k.

Under this condition one can prove easily that if

$$|p^{(\beta)}| + |x^{(\beta)}| \le C_1^{1+|\beta|}\varepsilon^{l-|\beta|}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + C_1 \tag{1.78}$$

holds for $|\beta| < |\alpha|$, then the second and third terms in the right-hand expressions of (1.75),(1.76) do not exceed

$$C_2^{1+|\beta|}\varepsilon^{l+1-|\alpha|}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + C_2\varepsilon^{1-\delta}\big(|p^{(\alpha)}| + |x^{(\alpha)}|\big) + C_2 \tag{1.79}$$

(actually $\delta = 0$ here).

[15)] This and the next assumptions can be arranged see [BrIvr] for the choice of mollification).

Remembering that $|\tau| \le \varepsilon^{-\delta}$ and thus increment of x is less than $\varepsilon^{1-\delta}$ we see that if we replace Λ_{ij} by its value at some of the point of the trajectory, say by $\bar{\Lambda}_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda_{ij}|_{\tau=0}$, then the error would not exceed (1.79) as well. Then since $\bar{\Lambda}$ generates a bounded group we see that inequality (1.78) holds for $\beta = \alpha$ too (because it holds for $\tau = 0$)

So, by induction inequality (1.78) holds for $|\tau| \le \varepsilon^{-\delta}$ and $|\beta| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon|$:

$$|\partial^\beta \phi_\tau| \le C_1^{1+|\beta|} \varepsilon^{l-|\beta|} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + C_1 \qquad \forall |\tau| \le \varepsilon^{-\delta}\ \forall |\beta| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| \tag{1.80}$$

This implies immediately

Lemma 1.12. *(i) If estimate*

$$|k^{(\alpha)}| \le M\Big(C_3^{|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{l-|\alpha|} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + 1\Big) \qquad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| \tag{1.81}$$

holds for symbol k then it holds for symbol $k \circ \phi_\tau$ with $|\tau| \le \varepsilon^\delta$ as well.

(ii) In particular, estimate (1.80) holds the principal symbol $k^0_\tau = k^0 \circ \phi_\tau$ of wannabe $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo $K = K(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-i\tau B} K_0 e^{i\tau B}$ where K_0 is $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ symbol k^0.

Considering transport equations

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} k_n + \sum_{m<n} \mathcal{L}_{n-m} k_m = 0 \tag{1.82}$$

we conclude that $\tilde{k} = \mathcal{L}_1 k_0$ satisfies

$$|\tilde{k}_1^{(\alpha)}| \le M C_2 \Big(C_3^{|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{l-|\alpha|-1} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + 1\Big) \qquad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| - 2 \tag{1.83}$$

and solving (1.82) (with $n = 1$) and with zero initial conditions we get that

$$|k_1^{(\alpha)}| \le M C_2 |\tau| \Big(C_3^{|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{l-|\alpha|-2} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\sigma} |\tau| + 1\Big) \qquad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| - 2. \tag{1.84}$$

Then both symbols $\tilde{k} = \mathcal{L}_1 k_1$ and $\tilde{k} = \mathcal{L}_2 k_0$ satisfy (1.84) with M replaced by $C_2 M |\tau| \varepsilon^{-2}$ and then k_2 satisfies (1.84) with the same modification (and in both cases $|\alpha| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| - 4$) and so on:

$$|k_n^{(\alpha)}| \le M C_3^{2n+|\alpha|} |\tau|^n \Big(\varepsilon^{l-2n-|\alpha|} |\log \varepsilon|^{-\sigma} + 1\Big) \quad \forall \alpha : |\alpha| \le \epsilon_0 |\log \varepsilon| - 2n. \tag{1.85}$$

Then composing symbol

$$k \sim \sum_n (\mu^{-1}h)^n k_n \tag{1.86}$$

we see that n-th term does not exceed (as $2n > l+1$)

$$M\Big(\frac{C_3^2\mu^{-1}h}{\varepsilon^2}\Big)^n |\tau|^n \varepsilon^{l+1} |\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma} \tag{1.87}$$

and it becomes less than Ch^s as $n = n(\varepsilon) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon_0 |\log\varepsilon|$ in the definition of $\varepsilon \ge C_0(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with large enough constant C_0.

So in fact we need to take

$$k(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n\le n(\varepsilon)} (\mu^{-1}h)^n k_n(\tau) \tag{1.88}$$

and modulo negligible operator $K(\tau) \equiv k(\tau)^{\mathrm{w}}$. Therefore we had proven

Lemma 1.13. *If symbol $k^0 \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ and $K_0 = k^{0\,\mathrm{w}}$ then for $|\tau| \le \varepsilon^{-\delta}$ modulo negligible operator $K = K(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{-i\tau B} K_0 e^{i\tau B} \equiv k(\tau)^{\mathrm{w}}$ is $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with symbol $k(\tau)$ defined by (1.88).*

This lemma implies that

$$\phi(B)k^{\mathrm{w}} \equiv \int \hat{\phi}(\tau) k(\mu h\tau)^{\mathrm{w}} e^{-i\mu h\tau B}\, d\tau \tag{1.89}$$

where $\hat{\phi}$ means Fourier transform of ϕ.

Note that

$$[A, e^{-i\mu h\tau B}] = -i\mu h \int_0^\tau e^{-i\mu h\tau' B} [A,B] e^{-i\mu h(\tau-\tau')B}\, d\tau' \tag{1.90}$$

and that by construction $[A,B] = \mu^{-1}hk^{\mathrm{w}}$ with

$$k = \sum_{\beta:|\beta|\le 4} k_\beta \mu^{|\beta|} p^\beta \qquad \text{with } k_\beta \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}. \tag{1.91}$$

Therefore

$$[A, e^{-i\mu h\tau B}] = -i\mu h \int_0^\tau k(\mu h\tau')^{\mathrm{w}}\, d\tau' \times e^{-i\mu h\tau B} \tag{1.92}$$

where $k(\tau)$ is defined according to the above rules.

One can check easily that

$$k(\tau) = \sum_{\alpha:|\beta|\le 4} k_\beta(\tau) \mu^{|\beta|} p^\beta \tag{1.93}$$

with

$$|k^{(\alpha)}_{n,\beta}(\tau)| \le C^{|\alpha|+1}|\tau|^n\Big(\varepsilon^{l-1-|\alpha|-2n}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma}+1\Big) \quad \forall n,\alpha : |\alpha| \le \epsilon_0|\log\varepsilon| - 2n. \tag{1.94}$$

Then one can prove easily that

$$|\partial^m_\tau k^{(\alpha)}_{0,\beta}(\tau)| \le M_m C^{m+|\alpha|+1}\Big(\varepsilon^{l-|\alpha|-1}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma}+1\Big) \qquad \forall m,\alpha : 2m+|\alpha| \le \epsilon_0|\log\varepsilon| \tag{1.95}$$

with $M_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{j\le m} q^j\cdot j^{m-j}$, $q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (|p|+\mu^{-1})\varepsilon^{-1} \ll 1$ (due to our assumptions and choice of C_0 in ε) and then one can prove easily that

$$M_m \le C^m m! e^{-m\log\left(\log m+|\log q|\right)}. \tag{1.96}$$

Similarly, one can prove easily that

$$|\partial^m_\tau k^{(\alpha)}_{n,\beta}(\tau)| \le M_m C^{m+n+|\alpha|+1}|\tau|^n\Big(\varepsilon^{l-|\alpha|-2n-1}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma}+1\Big) \qquad \forall m,n,\beta : 2m+n+|\beta| \le \epsilon_0|\log\varepsilon| \tag{1.97}$$

(improvements are possible but pointless).

Therefore, replacing $k_{n,\alpha}(\tau)$ it by Taylor decomposition with respect to τ, one commits an error with an operator norm not exceeding

$$CM_m(C\mu h)^m h^{-m_0}\frac{1}{m!}\int |\tau|^m|\hat\phi(\tau)|\,d\tau \le Ce^{Cm-m\log\left(\log m+|\log q|\right)-m|\log\mu h|+m\log m} \tag{1.98}$$

where m is the number of the first dropped power and m_0 is some fixed exponent. To make the last expression less than Ch^s it is enough to have

$$-m\log\big(\log m+|\log q|\big) - m|\log\mu h| + m|\log m| \le -C|\log h| - Cm. \tag{1.99}$$

Replacing $\big(\log m+|\log q|\big)$ by $|\log q|$ in the left side and minimizing it with respect to m we get $m=\bar m = C_1^{-1}(\mu h)^{-1}|\log q|$ and

$$(\mu h)^{-1}|\log q| \ge C|\log h|$$

or

$$|\log q| \ge C\mu h|\log h|$$

or

$$\varepsilon \geq (|p| + \mu^{-1})e^{C\mu h|\log h|}. \tag{1.100}$$

Since $|p| \leq C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in microlocal sense we can rewrite (1.99) as

$$\varepsilon \geq C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{C\mu h|\log h|} \tag{1.101}$$

and here ε varies from $C\mu^{-1}$ as $\mu = h^{-1}|\log h|$ to $h^{1-\delta}$ as $\mu h = \delta_1$.

In operator sense $|p| \leq C\mu^{-1}$ and we can rewrite (1.100) as $\varepsilon \geq C\mu^{-1}e^{C\mu h|\log h|}$ but (modulo choice of a constant) it is exactly the same!

1.6 Strong magnetic field. II

As a result we get

$$\phi(B)A \equiv \sum_{0\leq m\leq \bar{m}} \frac{1}{m!}(i\mu h)^m A_m \phi^{(m)}(B) \tag{1.102}$$

with A_m defined in a standard "smooth" way:

$$A_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{Ad}_B^m A; \qquad \operatorname{Ad}_B^0 A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A, \quad \operatorname{Ad}_B^m A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \big[B, \operatorname{Ad}_B^{m-1} A\big]. \tag{1.103}$$

The difference is that now $\phi^{(m)}(B)$ are still proper pdos but only with effective semiclassical parameter μh which is not very small. Anyway, symbols of A_m satisfy

$$|a_m^{(\alpha)}| \leq C^m \varepsilon^{-|\alpha|} M_m \leq C^m m! \varepsilon^{-|\alpha|} |\log q|^{-m} \tag{1.104}$$

Important thing is that

Lemma 1.14. *Let ϕ, ϕ_1 be two fixed admissible functions with disjoint supports. Then $\phi(B)A\phi_1(B) \equiv 0$.*

Proof of this lemma is obvious.

Now we can apply the same arguments as in Theorem 3.1 [BrIvr]. Consider $\varpi\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B - s) + C\mu^{-1}t\big)$. Apply it to $u^{\pm} = \theta(t)u$. Then

$$(hD_t - A)u^{\pm} = \mp ih\delta(t)\delta(x - y) \tag{1.105}$$

and applying $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo cutoff we get

$$(hD_t - A)v^{\pm} = \mp ihf(x, y), \qquad v = u\bar{\varphi}_y^{\dagger}(B)Q_y^{\dagger}, \ f = \delta(x - y)\bar{\varphi}_y^{\dagger}(B)Q_y^{\dagger} \tag{1.106}$$

where $\bar{\varphi}$ is supported in vicinity of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ while ϖ is our standard function and then

$$|\operatorname{Re} ih^{-1}\Big(\Big[(hD_t - A), \varpi\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)\Big]v^{\pm}, v^{\pm}\Big)| \le Ch^s. \tag{1.107}$$

Transforming this inequality we get

$$|\Big(\varpi'\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}, v^{\pm}\Big)| \le C_0^{-1}|\Big(\Big[A, \varpi\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)\Big]v^{\pm}, v^{\pm}\Big)| + Ch^s \tag{1.108}$$

where ϖ' is derivative of ϖ.

Taking ϖ to be a primitive of function φ^2 we get

$$\|\varphi\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}\|^2 \le C_0^{-1}\Big(\sum_{0\le m\le \bar{m}} \frac{1}{m!}k^m\|\varphi^{(m)}\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}\|\Big)^2 + Ch^s, \tag{1.109}$$

with $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_1\mu h|\log q|^{-1}$.

Increasing C_1 if needed (but neither C_0 depends on C_1 nor C_1 depends on C_0) we get the same estimate with the right-hand expression

$$C_0^{-1}\sum_{0\le m\le \bar{m}} \Big(\frac{1}{m!}k^m\|\varphi^{(m)}\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}\|\Big)^2 + Ch^s. \tag{1.110}$$

Plugging $\frac{1}{m!}k^m\varphi^{(m)}$ instead of φ and $(\bar{m}-m)$ instead of $\bar{m}$ into modified inequality (1.108) we get the same estimate with the right-hand expression (1.109) for

$$\Big(\frac{1}{m!}k^m\|\varphi^{(m)}\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}\|\Big)^2. \tag{1.111}$$

Taking a sum with respect to m, $0 \le m \le \bar{m}$, and again increasing C_1 we get that expression

$$\sum_{0\le m\le \bar{m}} \Big(\frac{1}{m!}r^m\|\varphi^{(m)}\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)v^{\pm}\|\Big)^2 \tag{1.112}$$

does not exceed itself multiplied by $C_0^{-1}C$ plus Ch^s where C does not depend on C_0. Taking C_0 large enough we get that expression (1.112) is negligible. So,

$$\|\varphi\big(\epsilon^{-1}(B-\lambda) + C_0\mu^{-1}t\big)u\bar{\varphi}_y^{\dagger}(B)Q_y^{\dagger}\| \le Ch^s. \tag{1.113}$$

Therefore we have proven

Lemma 1.15. *Let $\bar\varphi$ be supported in ϵ-vicinity of λ and $\varphi=1$ in 2ϵ-vicinity of λ. Then for $T\le T_1\stackrel{\rm def}{=} C_0^{-1}\epsilon\min(\mu,\mu^{l-1}|\log h|^\sigma)$*

$$\|\bigl(I-\varphi(B)\bigr)u\bar\varphi_y^\dagger(B)Q_y^\dagger\|\le Ch^s. \tag{1.114}$$

Furthermore, one can plug B_1 and B_2 instead of B and A; then it follows from lemma 1.15 that $\varphi(B_1)e^{i\tau_2B_2}\bar\varphi(B_1)\equiv 0$ as $|\tau|\le\epsilon\mu h^{-1}$. Multiplying by $\hat\varphi_2(\tau_2)\,d\tau_2$ and integrating we get

$$\varphi(B_1)\varphi_2(B_2)\bar\varphi(B_1)\equiv 0 \tag{1.115}$$

which allows us to apply simultaneous cut-off

$$\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\varphi_1(B_1)\cdot\varphi_2(B_2)\cdots\varphi_\nu(B_\nu) \tag{1.116}$$

and we get

Proposition 1.16. *Let conditions (1.67),(1.101) be fulfilled. Let functions $\bar\varphi_j$ be supported in ϵ-vicinities of λ_j and let $\varphi_j=1$ in 2ϵ-vicinities of λ_j. Then for $T\le T_1=\epsilon\min\bigl(\mu,\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^\sigma\bigr)$*

$$\|\bigl(1-\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)\bigr)u\bar\Phi_y^\dagger(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)Q_y^\dagger\|\le Ch^s. \tag{1.117}$$

Consider now the proof that singularities leave diagonal – again as theorem 3.1 [BrIvr] and theorem 2.2.7 of [Ivr1] with $\phi=\langle\ell,x-y\rangle\mp\epsilon tT^{-1}$. We plug-in $v\stackrel{\rm def}{=} u\bigl(\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)\bigr)_y^\dagger Q_y^\dagger$ localizing x near y and B_j near λ_j for all j, and take $\ell=\ell(y,\boldsymbol{\tau})$. I remind that B_j are linear combinations of $a_{\mathfrak{n}_k}$ and λ_j are corresponding linear combinations of τ_j.

To recover the proof we need to estimate from below $(\mu^2\sum_{j,k}p_j^{\rm w}K_{jk}p_k^{\rm w}w,w)$ with $w=\varpi(\phi)^{\rm w}v$, $v=\bar\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)u$ and $K_{jk}=\ell(g^{jk})$; one can assume that $V=-1$.

Due to proposition 1.16 one can replace w by $\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)w$ with a bit more wide supports of φ_j than those of $\bar\varphi_j$.

Let us introduce μ^{-1}-admissible partition $\psi_\nu(x)$ and on each element of it apply gauge transformation making $|V_j|\le C\mu^{-1}$. Rescaling $x\mapsto\mu(x-\bar x_\nu)$ we get (μh)-pdos $\mu p_j^{\rm w}$ and $\mu^2\sum_{j,k}p_j^{\rm w}K_{jk}p_k^{\rm w}$ while $\Phi(B)$ is a legitimate (μh)-pdo as well.

Then for $\mu h\le\epsilon_1$

$$\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)^*\Bigl(\mu^2\sum_{j,k}p_j^{\rm w}K_{jk}p_k^{\rm w}-\epsilon_0+C\mu h\Bigr)\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)$$

is non-negative operator and

$$\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)^*\mu^2\sum_{j,k} p_j^{\mathrm{w}} K_{jk} p_k^{\mathrm{w}}\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu) \ge \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_0\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)^*\Phi(B_1,\dots,B_\nu)$$

in operator sense and therefore

$$\Big(\mu^2\sum_{j,k} p_j^{\mathrm{w}} K_{jk} p_k^{\mathrm{w}} w, w\Big) \ge \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_0\|w\|^2 - Ch^s; \tag{1.118}$$

the rest of the proof needs no modifications.

Now applying the same approach as in the proof of proposition 1.5 we arrive to

Proposition 1.17. *Let conditions (1.67), (1.101) and microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 with* $\#\mathfrak{N}\ge 2$ *be fulfilled. Then estimate (1.51) holds for* $T\in[T_0,T_1]$ *with* $T_1=\epsilon\min\big(\mu,\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma}\big)$ *and* $T_0=C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|\le \epsilon_1(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$.

2 Canonical form

Now we need first reduce our operator to canonical form assuming that $(\bar l,\bar\sigma)\succeq(2,1)$ and

$$\mu_1^* \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \epsilon_1 h^{-\frac12}|\log h|^{-\frac12} \le \mu \le \mu_2^* \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \tag{2.1}$$

(case $\mu h\ge \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ and especially case $\mu h\ge C$ we consider later). We assume that

$$\varepsilon \ge C_0\mu^{-1} \tag{2.2}$$

rather than $\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$ as in [Ivr6]. This larger ε makes certain parts of our construction much simpler but leads to a larger error. In this section we consider $\mu^{-1}h$-quantization.

2.1 Reducing "main" part

First we need to reduce the main part. Consider point x in the vicinity of $\bar x$ and consider Hamiltonian fields H_{η_j} of η_j reduced to Σ_x^0 where η_j are linear combinations of $p_j=\xi_j-V_j$: $\eta_{2k-1}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\operatorname{Re}\zeta_k$, $\eta_{2k}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\operatorname{Im}\zeta_k$, $k=1,\dots,r$ and ζ_k are defined by (1.12)–(1.13) (rather than redefined by (1.20)–(1.21).

Consider symplectic map e^{tH_q} where $q = q(x;\eta_1,\dots,\eta_d)$ is a quadratic form

$$q(x;\eta_1,\dots,\eta_d) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j} q_{ij}(x)\eta_i\eta_j \tag{2.3}$$

with $q_{ij} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$. Note that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\eta_k \circ e^{tH_q}) = \{q,\eta_k\}\circ e^{tH_q} \equiv \sum_{i,j} q_{ij}\{\eta_i,\eta_k\}\eta_i \circ e^{tH_q} \tag{2.4}$$

modulo quadratic form. Then using arguments of subsection 3.1 of [Ivr6] we can prove easily that

$$\eta_k \circ e^{H_q} = \sum_j \beta_{kj}(x)\eta_j + \sum_{i,j} \beta'_{kij}(x,\xi)\eta_i\eta_j \tag{2.5}$$

with $\beta_{jk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$, $\beta'_{kij} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$. Here $\mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\beta_{jk}) = e^{\mathcal{Q}\Lambda}$ where $\Lambda = (\Lambda_{jm})$ with $\mathcal{Q} = (q_{kj})$ and $\Lambda_{jm} = 1$ as $j = 2i-1, m = 2i$, $\Lambda_{jm} = -1$ as $j = 2i, m = 2i-1$ and $\Lambda_{jm} = 0$ in all other cases. I remind that $\{\eta_j,\eta_m\}\big|_{\Sigma^0} = \Lambda_{jm}$.

Obviously, for given matrix $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ one can find symmetric matrix $\mathcal{Q} = (q_{ij})$ of the same regularity such that $\mathcal{B} = e^{F\Lambda}$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}$ is *symplectic* i.e. $\mathcal{B}^\dagger\Lambda\mathcal{B} = \Lambda$. In particular, one can transform (modulo quadratic form): η_1 into p_1, η_2 into $\beta_2 p_2$ with β_2 disjoint from 0 [16)], and η_3 into $p_3 + \beta_{3,1}p_1 + \beta_{3,2}p_2$, and η_4 into $\beta_4 p_3 + \beta_{4,1}p_1 + \beta_{4,2}p_2$ etc:

$$\mathcal{B}\eta_m = \eta'_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \qquad p_m + \sum_{j\le 2k-2} \beta_{mj}p_j \qquad \text{as } \ m = 2k-1, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathcal{B}\eta_m = \eta'_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_{mm}p_m + \sum_{j\le 2k-2} \beta_{m,j}p_j \qquad \text{as } \ m = 2k \tag{2.7}$$

where coefficients $\beta_{jk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$ are chosen to make $\{\eta'_j,\eta'_m\} = \Lambda_{jm}$.

Now let us consider $\mu^{-1}h$-do $Q = q^{\mathrm{w}}$ and transformation $T(t) = e^{it\mu h^{-1}Q}$ ("poor man's FIO").

Using arguments of subsection 3.1 of [Ivr6] one can prove easily that

$$T(1)\eta_k^{\mathrm{w}}T(-1) \equiv (\eta'_k)^{\mathrm{w}} + \Big(\sum_{i,j}\beta'_{kij}\eta'_i\eta'_j\Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.8}$$

[16)] Since $\{p_1,p_k\}$ is disjoint from 0 for some k and we just rename x_k into x_2 and v.v.

modulo operator with the norm not exceeding $C\mu^{-2}h$. Then for

$$A^0 = \mu^2\Big(\sum_{jk} b_{jk}(x)\,\eta_j\eta_k\Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.9}$$

we have

$$T(1)A^0T(-1) \equiv \mu^2\Big(\sum_{j,k} b_{jk}(x)\,\eta'_j\eta'_k\Big)^{\mathrm{w}} + \mu^2\Big(\sum_{i,j,k} b'_{ijk}\,\eta'_i\eta'_j\eta'_k\Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.10}$$

modulo operator with the norm not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h$ where $b'_{ijk} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$; we will skip $'$ in what follows.

Also, the same arguments show that

$$T(-1)V(x)T(1) \equiv V(x) + \sum_j (b''_j\,\eta_j)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.11}$$

modulo operator with norm not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h + C\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ where $b''_j \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$.

I remind that while b_{jk}, V are functions depending on x only, b'_{ijk}, b''_j are complete symbols. In the end of the day we decompose them in the powers of $\eta_1,\dots,\eta_{2r}$ as far as their smoothness allows.

Due to construction $\eta_1 = p_1 = \xi_1 - V_1(x)$ [17]. Note that we can get rid of V_1 using gauge transform, after which condition (0.22) still holds. Exactly here we need condition (0.22) rather than more natural (0.22)$'$. Otherwise we would be forced to confine ourselves to $C\varepsilon$-vicinity of $\bar{x}$ which would cause problems in section 3.

Then according to commutation property $\partial_{x_1}\eta_2 = 1$ on Σ^0. Further, by construction η_2 does not depend on $\xi_1, \xi_3, \dots, \xi_d$ and therefore

$$\eta_2 = \alpha(x,\xi_2)\big(x_1 - \lambda(x',\xi_2)\big), \qquad \alpha\big|_{\Sigma^0} = 1 \tag{2.12}$$

with $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+1,\bar{\sigma}}$ and $x' = (x_2,\dots,x_d)$. Let us redefine $\eta_2 = \big(x_1 - \lambda(x',\xi_2)\big)$.

(2.13) Without any loss of the generality we assume that $\bar{x} = 0$; otherwise in what follows one should replace x by $x - \bar{x}$.

Now we want to transform η_2 into x_1. To achieve this goal let us consider $T'(t) = e^{i\mu h^{-1}(\xi_1\lambda)^w}$. Then we have the series of exact equalities

$$T'(-t)D_1T(t) = D_1, \quad T'(-t)\lambda^{\mathrm{w}}T'(t) = \lambda^{\mathrm{w}}, \quad T'(-t)x_1T'(t) = x_1 + t\lambda^{\mathrm{w}}. \tag{2.14}$$

[17] I remind that η_k means η'_k defined by (2.6).

Therefore $T'(1)$ will transform "new" η_2^{w} into x_1. Now we need to check how this transformation will affect η_j^{w} with $j \ge 3$ and also α^{w}, b_{jk}^{w}, $b_{ijk}^{\prime\mathrm{w}}$, and finally V and $(b_j''\eta_j)^{\mathrm{w}}$.

Note that Hamiltonian function $p_1\lambda$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+2,\bar{\sigma}}$ [18]. Therefore Hamiltonian map $\Phi_t = e^{tH_{p_1\lambda}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+1,\bar{\sigma}}$ as $t \in [0,1]$ and then

$$\|T'(-t)\eta_j^{\mathrm{w}}T(t) - (\eta_j \circ \Phi_t)^{\mathrm{w}}\| \le C(\mu^{-1}h)^2\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}+2-3}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big)\times\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}+1-3}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big) \le C\mu^{-2}h, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\|T'(-t)b_{jk}^{\mathrm{w}}T(t) - (b_{jk} \circ \Phi_t)^{\mathrm{w}}\| \le C(\mu^{-1}h)^2\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}-3}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big)\times\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}+1-3}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big) \le C\mu^{-1}h, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\|T'(-t)b_{ijk}^{\mathrm{w}}T(t) - (b_{ijk} \circ \Phi_t)^{\mathrm{w}}\| \le C(\mu^{-1}h)^2\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}-4}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big)\times\Big(1+\varepsilon^{\bar{l}+1-3}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big) \le Ch, \tag{2.17}$$

Furthermore, (2.16) holds for α instead of b_{jk}.

Therefore transformation of A^0 given by (2.9) by $T'(1)$ leads to the same expression (2.9) but all the symbols η_j', b_{jk}' and b_{ijk}' are replaced by $\eta_j' \circ \Phi_1$, $b_{jk}' \circ \Phi_1$ and $b_{ijk}' \circ \Phi_1$ respectively and the total error does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h$.

Note that now η_1, η_2 are redefined as $p_1 \circ \Phi_1 = \xi_1$, $p_2 \circ \Phi_1 = x_1$ respectively.

Let us consider η_j with $j \ge 3$. Note that $\{p_1, \eta_j\} = 0$ on Σ^0 and therefore

$$\eta_j \circ \Phi_t = \eta_j + k_j\eta_1 + \sum_{k,i}\gamma_{jik}p_ip_k. \tag{2.18}$$

The same arguments hold for x_j with $j \ge 2$. Therefore, moving errors arising in the quadratic part of A^0 into its cubic part, we can replace $\eta_j \circ \Phi_t$ by $\eta_j + k_jp_1$ ($j \ge 3$), $x_j \circ \Phi_t$ by x_j ($j \ge 2$) and in b_{jk} we can replace $x_1 \circ \Phi_1 = x_1 - \lambda(x', \xi_2)$ just by $-\lambda(x', \xi_2)$.

From the beginning η_j with $j \ge 3$ could depend on ξ_1 (see (2.6), (2.7)). After above transformation $\eta_j \circ \Phi_1$ could acquire "more" ξ_1. Note however that originally $\{\eta_j, \eta_2\} = 0$ on Σ^0 and $\eta_2 \circ \Phi_1 = x_1$; therefore $\{\eta_j \circ \Phi_1, x_1\} = 0$ on Σ^0 and in $\eta_j \circ \Phi_1$, which are linear combination of $p_k \circ \Phi_1$, we can replace $p_k \circ \Phi_1$ by $\xi_k - V_k(0, x')$, $k \ge 3$ (modifying again

[18] Really, $\lambda \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+1,\sigma}$ and multiplication by p_1 increases regularity by 1 due to inequalities $|p_j| \le c\mu^{-1} \le \varepsilon$.

cubic terms); $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_d)$. Thus we arrive to the same quadratic expression but with $p_1 = \xi_1$, $p_2 = x_1$, $p_k = \xi_k - V_k(x_2, \dots, x_d; \xi_2)$, $b_{jk} = b_{jk}(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_d; \xi_2)$.

Repeating this process in the end of the day we arrive to the same quadratic expression with $\eta_{2k-1} = \xi_k$, $\eta_{2k} = x_k$ $(k = 1, \dots, r)$, $b_{jk} = b_{jk}(x'', \xi'')$ where now $x'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_{r+1}, \dots, x_{2r})$, $\xi'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\xi_{r+1}, \dots, \xi_{2r})$:

$$\mu^2 \sum_{j,k} b_{jk}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\, \eta_j^{\mathrm{w}} \eta_k^{\mathrm{w}} + \mu^2 \Big(\sum_{j,k,m} b_{jkm}\, \eta_j \eta_k \eta_m \Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.19}$$

with $b_{jkm} = b_{jkm}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$.

Also, considering transformation of $V(x)$ we see that at each step semiclassical error does not exceed $C(\mu^{-1}h)^2 \varepsilon^{l-3} |\log h|^{-\sigma} \le C\mu^{-1}h$ and in the end of the day we arrive to

$$W(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') + \Big(\sum_j b_j\, \eta_j \Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.20}$$

with $W \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ and $b_j = b_j(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$.

Therefore we proved

Proposition 2.1. *Let conditions (0.2), (2.1) and (2.2) be fulfilled, $\bar{x}$ be a fixed point and $\varepsilon \le R \le \epsilon_2$ with small enough constant ϵ_2. Then there exists a bounded operator $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

(i) For operators $Q = q^{\mathrm{w}}$ with symbol q supported in $B\big(0, R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $Q' = q_1'^{\mathrm{w}}$ with q_1' supported in $B\big((\bar{x}, 0), 2C_1R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and equal 1 in $B\big((\bar{x}, 0), C_1R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ the following equalities hold modulo negligible operators

$$(I - Q_1')\mathcal{T}Q \equiv 0, \tag{2.21}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^*\mathcal{T}Q \equiv Q \tag{2.22}$$

and modulo operators with norm not exceeding $C\mu^{-1}h$

$$\mathcal{T}^*\psi\mathcal{T} \equiv \bar{\psi}^{\mathrm{w}}, \tag{2.23}$$

$$\mathcal{T}^*A\mathcal{T}Q \equiv \mathcal{A}Q \tag{2.24}$$

with

$$\mathcal{A} = \mu^2 \sum_{i,j} b_{ij}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\bar{P}_i\bar{P}_j + \mu^2 \Big(\sum_{i,j,k} b_{ijk}\bar{p}_i\bar{p}_j\bar{p}_k \Big)^{\mathrm{w}} + b_0(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') + \Big(\sum_j b_i\bar{p}_i \Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.25}$$

where $b_{ij} \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l},\bar{\sigma}}$, $b_{ijk} = b_{ijk}(x,\xi) \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}-1,\bar{\sigma}}$, $b_0 \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$, $b_i = b_i(x,\xi) \in \mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$ *are real-valued,* $\bar{p}_{2k-1} = \xi_k$, $\bar{p}_{2k} = x_k$ $(k = 1,\dots,r)$, $\bar{P}_i = \bar{p}_i^{\mathrm{w}}$, $x' = (x_1,\dots,x_r)$, $x'' = (x_{r+1},\dots,x_{2r})$ *etc; I remind that* $\psi = \psi(x)$ *is a smooth function;*

(ii) For operators $Q' = q'^{\mathrm{w}}$ *with symbol* q' *supported in* $B\big((\bar{x},0),R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ *and* $Q_1 = q_1^{\mathrm{w}}$ *with symbol* q_1 *supported in* $B(0,2C_1R) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ *and equal* 1 *in* $B\big(0,C_1R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$

$$\|Q'\mathcal{T}(1-Q_1)\| \le Ch^s. \tag{2.26}$$

Remark 2.2. (i) Calculations show that

$$b_{ij} = b'_{ij} \circ \Psi_0, \qquad b_0 = V \circ \Psi_0, \quad \bar{\psi} = \psi \circ \Psi \tag{2.27}$$

where Ψ is a symplectic map $\mathbb{R}^{2d} \supset B(0,R) \to B\big((\bar{x},0),2C_1R\big)$ and $\Psi_0 = \Pi_x \Psi\big|_{\bar{\Sigma}^0}$ with $\bar{\Sigma}^0 = \{x' = \xi' = 0\}$ and

$$|\det D\Psi_0| = f_1 \cdots f_r; \tag{2.28}$$

(ii) I remind that one can rewrite quadratic part as

$$\mu^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\, Z_j^* Z_k - \mu h \sum_k a_{kk}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{2.29}$$

with $Z_k = \mu^{-1}hD_k - ix_k$, $Z_k^* = \mu^{-1}hD_k + ix_k$;

(iii) In particular, if $\#\mathfrak{m} = 1$ for all $\mathfrak{m}$ (no second-order resonances) one can rewrite quadratic form as

$$\sum_{1\le k\le r} f_j(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\,\big(h^2D_k^2 + \mu^2 x_k^2\big). \tag{2.30}$$

2.2 Reducing next terms

There is very little what we can do else because of all the resonances. We already finished transformation of the "main part"

$$\mathcal{A}_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu^2 \sum_{i,j} b_{ij}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\bar{P}_i\bar{P}_j + b_0(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{2.31}$$

where one can rewrite quadratic part as (2.29); in what follows the quadratic part and the potential of operator generate corrections which could be written in the form

$$\mu^2 \sum_{\alpha:\, 3\le|\alpha|\le\lceil(\bar{l},\bar{\sigma})\rceil+1} b''_\alpha(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\,(\bar{p}^\alpha)^{\mathrm{w}}, \tag{2.32}$$

$$\sum_{\alpha:1\le|\alpha|\le\lceil(l,\sigma)\rceil-1} b'''_\alpha(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\,(\bar{p}^\alpha)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.33}$$

modulo terms with norms not exceeding $C\mu^{-\bar{l}}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}$, $C\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$ respectively with $b''_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}^{\bar{l}+2-|\alpha|,\bar{\sigma}}$, $b'''_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}^{l-|\alpha|,\sigma}$. Here and below $\lceil (l,\sigma)\rceil = \lceil l\rceil$ unless $l\in\mathbb{Z}, \sigma>0$ in which case $\lceil (l,\sigma)\rceil = l+1$ etc.

The major problem are resonances. The second-order resonances ($f_i = f_j$ as $i\neq j$) prevent us from diagonalization of quadratic form as in (2.30). We can only rewrite quadratic form as (2.29).

Now it is easy to get rid of non-resonant terms of third-order in the main part and of first order terms in V. Let us consider transformation

$$U = \Bigl(e^{i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}\left(\mu^2 S_3(x'',\xi'';x',\xi')+S_1(x'',\xi'';x',\xi')\right)}\Bigr)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.34}$$

which is a pseudo-differential operator as $\mu \geq Ch^{-\frac{1}{3}}|\log h|^{\frac{1}{3}}$. As a result principal part $\mathcal{A}_0$ does not change, and the next terms

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mu^2 a_1^{\mathrm{w}}, \qquad a_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|=3} b''_\alpha(x'',\xi'')\,\bar{p}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|=1} b'''_\alpha(x'',\xi'')\,\bar{p}^\alpha \tag{2.35}$$

(which have norms $O(\mu^{-1})$) are replaced by

$$\mathcal{A}_1 + \bigl\{\bar{a}^0, \mu^2 S_3 + S_1\bigr\}'^{\mathrm{w}} + \dots \tag{2.36}$$

with $\bar{a}^0 = \sum_{i,j} b_{ij}(x'',\xi'')\,p_i p_j$ and "short" Poisson brackets $\{.,.\}'$ (with respect to (x',ξ') only). Here dots denote terms of the same types (2.32) with $|\alpha|\geq 4$ (modulo $O(\mu^{-\bar{l}}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}})$) and of type (2.33) with $|\alpha|\geq 2$(modulo $O(\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma})$).

By an appropriate choice of S_3 and S_1 we can eliminate all terms in the "main part" $\mu^2 a_1 + \bigl\{\bar{a}^0, \mu^2 S_3 + S_1\bigr\}'$ save corresponding to third-order resonances;

$$\mathrm{Re}\Bigl(\mu^2 \sum_{m,j,k} b''_{mjk}(x'',\xi''\,\zeta_m^\dagger \zeta_j \zeta_k\Bigr) \tag{2.37}$$

where $\zeta_m = \xi_m + ix_m$, $m=1,\dots,r$ (we can assume without any loss of the generality that

$$\{\bar{a}^0, \zeta_m\}' = \sum_n i f_{mn}\zeta_n \tag{2.38}$$

where matrix (f_{mn}) has only positive eigenvalues if_k.

Note that sum (2.37) is restricted to m,j,k such that f_m is not disjoint from f_j+f_k; in particular $b''_{mjk}=0$ unless $m,j,k\in\mathfrak{n}\in\mathfrak{N}$.

One can get rid of non-resonant fourth-order (2.32) and second-order terms (2.33) in the same way but while the second-order resonant terms are only

(i) $\zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k$ with j, k belonging to the same $\mathfrak{m}$-group,

the fourth-order resonant terms include

(ii) $\zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k \zeta_m \zeta_n$ and $\zeta_j \zeta_k^\dagger \zeta_m^\dagger \zeta_n^\dagger$ with f_j not disjoint from $f_k + f_m + f_n$" and also

(iii) $\zeta_j^\dagger \zeta_k^\dagger \zeta_m \zeta_n$ with $f_j + f + k$ not disjoint from $f_m + f_n$

which we never intended to cover. The same is true for fifth-order terms too.

Still we need to have some concern about only third, fourth and fifth order terms in (2.32) and second and third order terms in (2.33) because for $\mu \ge \epsilon h^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ only these terms could be larger than $C\mu^{-1}h$.

Thus we arrive to

Proposition 2.3. *Let conditions (0.2), (2.1) and (2.2) be fulfilled, $\bar{x}$ be a fixed point. Then there exists a bounded operator $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

(i) For operators $Q = q^{\mathrm{w}}$ with symbol q supported in $B\big(0,R\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $Q' = q_1'^{\mathrm{w}}$ with q_1' supported in $B\big((\bar{x},0),1\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and equal 1 in $B\big((\bar{x},0),1\big) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ equalities (2.21), (2.22) hold modulo negligible operators and equalities (2.23), (2.24) hold modulo operators with norms not exceeding $C\big(\mu^{-1}h + \mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\big)$ with

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 + \mu^2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\alpha,\beta:\, 3\le|\alpha|+|\beta|\le\lceil(l,\sigma)\rceil+1} b''_{\alpha\beta}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') \big(\zeta^\alpha \zeta^{\dagger\,\beta}\big)^{\mathrm{w}} + \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\alpha,\beta:1\le|\alpha|+|\beta|\le\lceil(l,\sigma)\rceil-1} b'''_{\alpha\beta}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') \big(\zeta^\alpha \zeta^{\dagger\,\beta}\big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{2.39}$$

with $\mathcal{A}_0$ defined by (2.31) (and equal to (2.29)) and with symbols $b''_{\alpha\beta}, b'''_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathcal{F}^{l-|\alpha|-|\beta|,\sigma}$ and $b''_{\alpha\beta} = b'''_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ unless

$$|\sum_j (\alpha_j - \beta_j) f_j| \le \epsilon \tag{2.40}$$

with arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon > 0$.

(ii) Further,

$$\bar{\psi} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta:1\le|\alpha|+|\beta|\le\lceil(l,\sigma)\rceil-1} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha\beta}(x'', \xi'')\, \zeta^\alpha \zeta^{\dagger\,\beta}, \tag{2.41}$$

where $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathcal{F}^{l-|\alpha|-|\beta|,\sigma}$ and

$$\bar{\psi}_{00} = \psi \circ \Psi_0, \tag{2.42}$$

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{\gamma:1\le|\gamma|\le|\alpha|+|\beta|} c_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\partial_x^\gamma) \circ \Psi_0 \quad \text{as} \quad |\alpha| + |\beta| \ge 1; \tag{2.43}$$

(iii) Statement (ii) of proposition 2.1 remains true.

I remind that only cubic terms are obstacles in the proof that $\bar{a}^0_{\mathtt{m}}$ does not change much; we prove this statement only for $\bar{a}^0_{\mathtt{n}}$.

2.3 Strong magnetic field case

The same construction works in the strong magnetic field case

$$\mu_2^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu_4^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Ch^{-1} \tag{2.44}$$

but in this case one needs to take

$$\varepsilon = C(\mu^{-1}h|\log \mu|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.45}$$

(or larger) and restriction to p_j is now

$$|p_j| \le C\varepsilon. \tag{2.46}$$

However, in operator rather than microlocal sense we have still

$$\|p_j^{\mathrm{w}}\| \le C\mu^{-1} \tag{2.47}$$

on energy levels below c_0 and we should estimate perturbations based on this estimate rather than (2.46).

Note, that now we need to take in account only the third and fourth order terms in the first sum in the right-hand expression of (2.39) and only the first and second order terms in the second sum in the right-hand expression of (2.39). Similarly in (2.41) we need to sum as $|\alpha| + |\beta| \le 2$.

2.4 Superstrong magnetic field case

The same construction also works in the superstrong magnetic field case

$$\mu \ge \mu_3^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon h^{-1} \tag{2.48}$$

we should take again ε by (2.45) and inequality (2.46) again holds in the microlocal sense but (2.47) is replaced by

$$\|p_j^{\mathrm{w}}\| \le \varsigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}}h^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.49}$$

Really, due to our assumption (0.34)

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \mu^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{m}\in\mathfrak{M}} \sum_{j,k\in\mathfrak{m}} a_{jk}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\, Z_j^* Z_k + b_0'(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{2.50}$$

with symbol $b_0' \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$.

Then the principal part of operator $\bar{A}_0$ is of magnitude $C\mu h$ while norms of perturbations $\bar{A}_1$, $\bar{A}_2$, $\bar{A}_3$, $\bar{A}_4$ do not exceed $C\mu h\varsigma$, $C\mu h\varsigma^2 = Ch^2$, $C\mu h\varsigma^3$, $C\mu h\varsigma^4 = C\mu^{-1}h^3$ respectively and only the last one could be ignored for really large μ. This is the reason beyond correction $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{2\mathrm{corr}}$ in theorem 0.9. It is an also one of the reasons beyond last term in the right-hand expression of estimate (0.39) and the corresponding extra-smoothness requirement there to get the best possible estimate; another reason is mollification error.

Anyway, in both strong and superstrong cases we arrive to

Proposition 2.4. *Statements of proposition 2.3 remains true in both strong and superstrong magnetic field cases with (2.24) holding modulo operator $\mathcal{R}$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{R}v\| \le C\Big(\varepsilon^{l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma} + \mu h\varepsilon^{\bar{l}}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\Big)\,\|v\| + \varepsilon^{-\bar{l}}|\log\mu|^{-\bar{\sigma}}\,\|\mathcal{A}v\| \qquad \forall v \tag{2.51}$$

with ε given by (2.45).

2.5 Canonical form. Special case

One can consider it as a pilot-model for this section.

If g^{jk}, F_{jk} are constant then $V_j(x)$ are linear functions and A^0 is transformed into exactly

$$\sum_{1\le j\le r} f_j\Big(h^2D_j^2 + \mu^2 x_j^2\Big) \tag{2.52}$$

by $\mu^{-1}h$-metaplectic transformation which consists of the following steps:

(i) Change of variables $(x, \mu^{-1}hD) \mapsto (Qx, Q^{t\,-1}\mu^{-1}hD)$ transforming g^{jk} into δ_{jk} and F into matrix with $F_{j,j+r} = f_j$, $F_{j+r,j} = -f_j$ and other elements 0. It transforms $V(x)$ into $V(Qx)$.

(ii) Gauge transformation (multiplication by $e^{i\mu h^{-1}S(x)}$ with quadratic form $S(x)$, transforming $A_j(x)$ into 0 and $A_{j+r}(x)$ into f_jx_j for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Then A^0 is transformed into

$$h^2 \sum_{1\le j\le r} \Big(D_j^2 + \big(D_{j+r} - f_j\mu h^{-1}x_j\big)^2\Big) \tag{2.53}$$

and $V(x)$ is preserved.

(iii) Fourier transform: $(x', x''; \mu^{-1}hD', \mu^{-1}hD') \mapsto (x', -\mu^{-1}hD'; \mu^{-1}hD', x)$ transforming A^0 into

$$h^2 \sum_{1\le j\le r} \Big(D_j^2 + \mu^2 h^{-2}\big(x_{j+r} - f_j x_j\big)^2\Big) \tag{2.54}$$

and $V(x)$ into $V(x', -\mu^{-1}hD')$.

(iv) Change of variables $(x', x''; \mu^{-1}hD', \mu^{-1}hD') \mapsto (x' - Kx'', x'; \mu^{-1}hD', \mu^{-1}hD'' - K^t\mu^{-1}hD')$ with $K_{j,j+r} = f_j$ and other elements 0 transforming A^0 into

$$\sum_{1\le j\le r} \Big(h^2 D_j^2 + f_j^2\mu^2 x_j^2\Big) \tag{2.55}$$

and V into $V(x' - Kx'', \mu^{-1}hD'' - K^t\mu^{-1}hD')$ with Weyl quantization. All other steps are the same as above. Moreover, if we do not look for uniformity, we can replace ϵ by 0 in condition (2.40).

3 Mid-range propagation

By mid-range propagation we assume propagation for $\mathcal{A}$ and for $\mathcal{T}^*\mathcal{A}\mathcal{T}$ as $T \in [T_0', T_1']$ with

$$T_1' = C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac12}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$T_0' = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h| \le C\mu h|\log h|; \tag{3.2}$$

we are interested almost exclusively in extending proposition 1.4. Here T_1' is what used to be T_0 and T_0' is a natural improvement of T_0 as if $\mathcal{A}$ was $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo $\mathcal{A}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$ satisfying microhyperbolicity condition.

However T_0' is still pretty large unless we increase ε and thus smoothness assumptions. Instead in the next section we consider (smoothness-dependent) rate of decay of the left-hand expression of (1.51) on interval $[T_0'', T_1'']$ with $T_1'' = T_0'$ and $T_0'' = Ch$.

3.1 Intermediate magnetic field case

Let us consider intermediate magnetic field case (2.1).

Consider a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{\xi})$. During time T_1 point (x'', ξ'') will stay in $C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$-vicinity of $(\bar{x}'', \bar{\xi}'')$ in both classical and microlocal senses (see proposition 1.2 for the proof in the microlocal sense).

According to subsection 2.2

$$A_{\mathcal{T}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{T}^* A \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{R}, \tag{3.3}$$

with

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{0\le m\le \lceil (l,\sigma)\rceil -1} \mathcal{A}_m, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \rho(x, \mu^{-1}hD), \qquad \rho \in \mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}\mathcal{F}^{0,0}, \tag{3.5}$$

$\mathcal{A}_0$ given by (2.31) (where one can rewrite quadratic part as (2.29) in the general case and as (2.30) as $\#\mathfrak{m}=1$ for all $\mathfrak{m}$) and

$$\mathcal{A}_m = \mu^2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\alpha,\beta:\, 3\le|\alpha|+|\beta|=m+2} b''_{\alpha\beta}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\left(\zeta^\alpha \zeta^{\dagger\,\beta}\right)^{\mathrm{w}} + \tag{3.6}$$

$$\operatorname{Re} \sum_{\alpha,\beta:1\le|\alpha|+|\beta|=m} b'''_{\alpha\beta}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\left(\zeta^\alpha \zeta^{\dagger\,\beta}\right)^{\mathrm{w}}$$

(see (2.39)) and $\zeta_j = \xi_j + ix_j$, $\zeta_j^\dagger = \xi_j - ix_j$, $j=1,\dots,r$.

Remark 3.1. Surely we need to remember that $\mathcal{A}$ and $A_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}^* A \mathcal{T}$ are close but not equal. In [Ivr6] we considered $\mathcal{A}$ and took $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{T}^*$ as approximation[19)] but now we have the global reduction only in the special case of condition (0.22) while until next section I need only (0.22)′. The following statements hold both for $\mathbf{U}' = \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}^* e^{-h^{-1}At}\mathcal{T}$ and its Schwartz kernel $u' = u_{\mathcal{T}}$ and for $\mathbf{U}' = e^{ih^{-1}\mathcal{A}t}$ and its Schwartz kernel u'.

Proposition 3.2. *Let u' be defined in remark 3.1. Let ϕ_1 be supported in $B(0,1)$, $\phi_2 = 1$ in $B(0,2)$, χ be supported in $[-1,1]$. Let $Q_k = \phi_{k,M\mu^{-1}T}(x''-\bar{x}'', \xi''_x - \bar{\xi}'')^{\mathrm{w}}$. Then for $T_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C(\mu h|\log h)^{\frac12} \le T \le T_1' = C_0 T_0'$ and large enough constant M*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\big(1-Q_{2x}\big)u_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t)Q^t_{1,y}| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau \le c. \tag{3.7}$$

The same estimate holds if we replace $\phi_*(x'')$ by $\phi_*(x''', \mu^{-1}hD_{IV})$ with $x'' = (x'''; x^{IV})$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let u' be defined in remark 3.1. Let $m = \#\mathfrak{M} \ge 2$ and let ϕ_j be functions as before. Then for $C(\mu h|\log h|)^{\frac12} \le T \le \epsilon_0$*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\big(1-\phi_{2,T}(\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{m}_1}-\tau_1,\dots,\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{m}_m}-\tau_m)\big)^{\mathrm{w}}\times \tag{3.8}$$

$$\times\, u'(x,y,t)\big(\phi_{1,T}(\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{m}_1}-\tau_1,\dots,\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{m}_m}-\tau_m)\big)^{\mathrm{w}\,t}_y| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau, |\tau| \le \epsilon_1.$$

[19)] I remind that actually we consider A_ε instead of A, so we already have an approximation.

Both propositions 3.2–3.3 are proven by the same scheme as in [Ivr6]:

To prove proposition 3.2 one can use function

$$\varpi\Big(\big(\frac{\mu^2|x''-\bar{x}''|^2}{T^2}+\epsilon^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}-C\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Big) \tag{3.9}$$

with ϖ function of the same type as used in theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr], $\varsigma=\pm1$ depending on time direction and arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon>0$.

To prove proposition 3.2 one can use function

$$\varpi\Big(\big(\frac{\mu^4\sum_j|a_{\mathtt{m}_j}-\tau_{\mathtt{m}_j}|^2}{T^2}+\epsilon^2\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}-C\varsigma\frac{t}{T}\Big). \tag{3.10}$$

Because $T\le\epsilon_0$ and we picked up $v=1$ rather than given by (1.40), third-order resonances do not pose any problem here. Even if at this stage decomposition in Hermitian functions is not very useful, we can study propagation using only functions of (x'',ξ'',t).

Proposition 3.4. *Let u' be defined in remark 3.1. Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Then for $T\in[T_0',T_1']$, $\tau\in[-\epsilon',\epsilon']$*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma''Qu|\le C\mu^{-s} \tag{3.11}$$

where $Q=Q(x,\mu^{-1}hD)$ and here and below Γ'' is a partial trace (with respect to x'' only).

We can assume that $\ell(\bar{x}'',\bar{\xi}'';\bar{\tau}_1,\dots,\bar{\tau}_m)$ has zero x''-component and is equal to $(\ell',0)$. Otherwise one can achieve it by a linear symplectic transformation in (x'',ξ'') and corresponding FIO (which will be a metaplectic operator in this case). Then using

$$\varpi\Big(\mu T^{-1}\langle\ell',x''-y''\rangle\pm\epsilon tT^{-1}\Big) \tag{3.12}$$

which is admissible pdo-symbol one can prove proposition 3.4 in the standard way. Since proposition 3.3 holds with with $\mathfrak{M}$ instead of $\mathfrak{N}$, the same is true for 3.4 as well (but not for corollary below).

Propositions 1.5 and 3.4 imply immediately

Corollary 3.5. *(i) Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 estimate (1.51) holds for $T\in[T_0',T_1]$ with T_1 defined in section 1: $T_1=\epsilon\mu$ as $\#\mathfrak{N}=1$ and $T=\epsilon\in(\mu,\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma})$ as $\#\mathfrak{N}>1$.*

(ii) Also estimate (1.60) holds with T_0 replaced by T_0'.

Corollary 3.6. *Theorem 0.1 holds in the case of intermediate magnetic field (and thus is proven).*

Proof. Picking $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h|$ we get approximation error $Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^l|\log h|^{l-\sigma}$ and $T'_0 = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$. Then we again have estimates (1.61), (1.62) and need just calculate expression (1.63) which is equivalent (modulo negligible) to (1.64) where without spoiling remainder estimate we can take only terms with $m = 0$ and $n \le n(\delta)$ as $\mu \le h^{-1+\delta}$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$. The rest repeats arguments of subsection 1.4. □

3.2 Strong magnetic field case

Let now $\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \epsilon_1 h^{-1}$.

Then analysis makes real sense only for $\varepsilon \gg (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$ because $T'_1 \asymp T'_0$ for $\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$. Still even in the latter case we need to state propositions similar to propositions 3.3–3.4.

Proposition 3.7. *Proposition 3.2 remains true with T'_0, T'_1 defined by (3.1), (3.2) as*

$$\mu^*_2 = \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu^*_4 = C_0 h^{-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

Proposition 3.8. *Proposition 3.3 remains true with $T = T'_1$ defined by (3.1) as*

$$\mu^*_2 = \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu^*_3 = \epsilon_1 h^{-1} \tag{3.14}$$

with small enough constant $\epsilon_1 > 0$.

Proposition 3.9. *Proposition 3.4 remains true with T'_0, T'_1 defined by (3.1), (3.2) under assumption (3.13) as $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ in microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 and under assumption (3.14) as $\#\mathfrak{N} > 1$ in microhyperbolicity condition 0.1.*

Proofs of propositions 3.7, 3.9 repeat those of propositions 3.2, 3.4. Proof of proposition 3.8 repeats arguments of subsections 1.5, 1.6 dedicated to the proof of proposition 1.17.

3.3 Superstrong magnetic field case

This case is split into two subcases:

$$\mu^*_3 = \epsilon_1 h^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu^*_4 = C_0 h^{-1}, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\mu \ge \mu^*_4 = C_0 h^{-1}. \tag{3.16}$$

In the former subcase we have proposition 3.7 and its long-range version proposition 1.9 but we neither have nor can have (in general) proposition 3.8; further, proposition 3.9 is proven (as $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$) under too restrictive condition 0.1 rather than more appropriate condition 0.2. In the latter subcase we have nothing about propagation at all.

3.3.1 Hermitian decomposition

In both cases, however, we can apply very usefully decomposition (0.49)

$$u_{\mathcal{T}}(x,y,t) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^{+r}} u_{\alpha\beta}(x'',y'',t)\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\Upsilon_\beta(y') \tag{3.17}$$

with $\Upsilon_\alpha(x') = \upsilon_\alpha\bigl(\mu^{\frac12}h^{-\frac12}x'\bigr)$ and $\Upsilon_\alpha(x) = \prod_{1\le j\le r}\upsilon_{\alpha_j}(x_j)$ and Hermite functions υ_{α_j}.

Note that

$$\mathcal{A}_0\Bigl(\upsilon_\alpha(x'')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\Bigr) = \sum_{\beta:|\beta|=|\alpha|,|\beta-\alpha|=0,2} \Bigl(\mu h\mathcal{A}^0_{\beta\alpha}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'') + \delta_{\alpha\beta}\, q_0(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\Bigr)\upsilon_\alpha\cdot\Upsilon_\beta(x') \tag{3.18}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^0_{\beta\alpha} = \begin{cases} \sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)b_{jj} & \text{as } \beta=\alpha,\\ 2\sqrt{\alpha_j\beta_k}\, b_{jk} & \text{as } \beta_i-\alpha_i = \delta_{ik}-\delta_{ij}.\end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

Further, $\mathbb{H}_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigl\{\sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|=n}\upsilon_\alpha(x'')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\bigr\}$ are invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{A}_0$ and

$$\operatorname{Spec}\bigl(\mathcal{A}^0_{\alpha\beta}(x'',\xi'')\bigr)_{\alpha,\beta}\Big|_{\mathbb{H}_n} = \Bigl\{\sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)f_j, |\alpha|=n\Bigr\}. \tag{3.20}$$

3.3.2 Special case of constant g^{jk}, F_{jk}

This is far the easiest case. First, we can assume with no loss of the generality that

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0. \tag{3.21}$$

Really, no cubic terms appear from "kinetic" part of Hamiltonian $\sum_j g^{jk}P_jP_k$ and first-order terms appearing from potential are eliminated in the process of reduction. Further, we can skip an error $O(\varepsilon^l|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma})$ and for $(l,\sigma)\succeq(2,0)$ we can skip quadratic terms appearing from potential because in operator sense they are less than $\mu^{-2}(\mathcal{A}^0+1)$ and since our reduction in this case is global, we can just take approximate operator as $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{A}_0\mathcal{T}^*$.

Further, we can assume with no loss of the generality that $b_{jk} = f_j\delta_{jk}$ and then

$$\mathcal{A}\Bigl(\upsilon_\alpha(x'')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\Bigr) = \Bigl(\sum_j (2\alpha_j+1)f_j\mu h + q_0\Bigr)\upsilon_\alpha(x'')\cdot\Upsilon_\alpha(x'). \tag{3.22}$$

Now we are dealing with r-dimensional scalar $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos and the proofs of the following two statements are obvious:

Proposition 3.10. *Let g^{jk}, F_{jk} be constant and one of conditions (3.15), (3.16) be fulfilled. Let $Q = q(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$. Assume that on support q ellipticity condition (0.41) is fulfilled. Then for $T \ge Ch|\log h|$, $\tau \in [-\epsilon', \epsilon']$ (with small enough constant $\varepsilon' > 0$)*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\bar{\chi}_T(t) u_{\mathcal{T}} Q_y^t\Big)| \le CT\mu^{-s}. \tag{3.23}$$

The proof is based on standard elliptic arguments.

Proposition 3.11. *Let g^{jk}, F_{jk} be constant and one of conditions (3.15), (3.16) be fulfilled. Let $Q = q(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$. Assume that on support q microhyperbolicity condition (0.19) is fulfilled. Then for $T \in [T_0', T_1]$, $\tau \in [-\epsilon', \epsilon']$*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\chi_T(t)\Gamma'' u_{\mathcal{T}} Q_y^t\Big)| \le C\mu^{-s}. \tag{3.24}$$

The proof is based on our standard microhyperbolicity arguments.

3.3.3 Not-ultrastrong magnetic field case

Assume that of condition (3.15) holds.

Consider operator $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ as $\mu^{-1}h$-pdo with respect to x' with "matrix" symbol with values in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{H})$ where $\mathbb{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^r_{x'})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}_1, \mathbb{H}_2)$ is the space of linear operators from $\mathbb{H}_2$ to $\mathbb{H}_1$. Obviously $\mathcal{A}$ falls into this class, but we can also replace $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ by $\mathcal{A}_0 + Q_1^*(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{A}_0)Q_1$ where $Q_1 = I - \phi(\varepsilon^{-1}x', \varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}hD')$ and ϕ is supported in $2C_1$-vicinity and equal 1 in C_1-vicinity of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d_{x'',\xi''}$. Applied to u, Q_1 produces negligible output (after applying $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)$ with $\tau \le c$ and $Ch|\log h| \le T \le ch^{-s}$.

Then standard elliptic arguments imply

Proposition 3.12. *Let condition (3.15) be fulfilled. Let $Q = q(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$. Assume that on support q ellipticity condition (0.41) is fulfilled. Then for $T \ge Ch|\log h|$, $\tau \in [-\epsilon', \epsilon']$ (with small enough constant $\varepsilon' > 0$) estimate (3.23) holds.*

Furthermore

Proposition 3.13. *Let condition (3.15) be fulfilled. Let $Q = q(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$. Assume that on support q microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 is fulfilled. Then for $T \in [T_0', T_1]$, $\tau \in [-\epsilon', \epsilon']$ estimate (3.24) holds.*

Proof is based on standard arguments of [BrIvr] combined with observation that the required microhyperbolicity condition

$$\big\langle \big(\ell \mathcal{A}_0(x'', \xi'')\big)v, v\big\rangle \ge \epsilon_0 |v|^2 - C|(\mathcal{A}_0 - \tau)v|^2 \qquad \forall v \in \mathbb{H} \tag{3.25}$$

is equivalent to condition 0.2 (with ℓ depending on (x'',ξ'') only). Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and $|\cdot|$ denote inner product and norm in $\mathbb{H}$.

Note that we need the single direction ℓ. We just cannot localize in $(\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_1},\dots,\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_\nu}$ even after reduction. This is really frustrating because Poisson brackets $\{\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_j},\mu^2 a^0_{\mathfrak{n}_k}\}$ are $O(\mu^3 h|p|^4)$ which is $O(\mu h^3|\log h|^2)$ even in microlocal sense.

3.3.4 Ultrastrong magnetic field case

Assume that of condition (3.15) holds. Then we should take into account that unless F_{jk}, g^{jk} are constant (the case we already considered), generally variations of $\mu h f_j$ are of magnitude μh. To overcome this difficulty we need to assume that condition (0.36)-(0.37) holds.

We still need to deal with the fact that we have only local reduction and thus $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ differs from $\mathcal{A}$ by operator $\mathcal{A}'$ with symbol belonging to $\omega\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ with

$$\omega = \varepsilon^l |\log\mu|^{-\sigma} + \mu h \varepsilon^{\bar l} |\log\mu|^{-\bar\sigma}. \tag{3.26}$$

Lemma 3.14. *Let $b\in\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ be supported in $\{|x'|+|\xi'|\le c\varepsilon\}$. Then operator*

$$b^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta} : \mathbb{K}\ni v\to \langle b^{\mathrm{w}}(v\otimes\Upsilon_\beta),\Upsilon_\alpha\rangle\in\mathbb{K},\qquad \mathbb{K}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} L^2(\mathbb{R}^r_{x''}) \tag{3.27}$$

has norm

$$\|b^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta}\|\le Ce^{-\epsilon|\alpha-\beta|}. \tag{3.28}$$

Proof. Obviously, it is sufficient to prove lemma as $x'\in\mathbb{R}^1$ (with $x''\in\mathbb{R}^r$). Then since

$$H_j\Upsilon_\beta = (2\beta_j+1)\mu h\Upsilon_\beta,\qquad H_j\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\mu h(|\zeta_j|^2)^{\mathrm{w}} = \mu^2x_j^2+h^2D_j^2 \tag{3.29}$$

we conclude that

$$b^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta} = (\alpha_j-\beta_j)^{-1}\bigl\{|\zeta_j|^2,b\bigr\}^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta} \tag{3.30}$$

and continuing this process we conclude that $b^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta} = (\alpha_j-\beta_j)^{-n}(b_{(n)})^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta}$ with $b_{(0)}=b$ and $b_{(n)} = \bigl\{|\zeta_j|^2, b_{(n-1)}\bigr\}$. One can see easily $b_{(n)}\in C^n n!\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ uniformly with respect to n [20] operator norm of $b^{\mathrm{w}}_{(n)}$ in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{H}\otimes\mathbb{K},\mathbb{H}\otimes\mathbb{K})$ does not exceed $C^n n!$ and then operator norm of $b^{\mathrm{w}}_{\alpha\beta}$ in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{K},\mathbb{K})$ does not exceed $|\alpha_j-\beta_j|^{-n}C^n n!$. It reaches minimum $e^{-\epsilon|\alpha_j-\beta_j|}$ as $n=C^{-1}|\alpha_j-\beta_j|$. □

[20] With simultaneous decay of the number of derivatives checked, but everything works as long as $n\le \epsilon|\log\varepsilon|$.

So far we did not use condition (0.36)-(0.37).

(i) *Assume first that all f_j are disjoint.* Then

$$\mathcal{A}_0 = \sum_{1\le j\le r} b_j(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')(\mu^2 x_j^2 + h^2 D_j^2) + b_0(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{3.31}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_0\big(v(x'')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\big) = (W_\alpha v)\Upsilon_\alpha(x') \tag{3.32}$$

with

$$W_{\bar\alpha} = \big(V + \sum (2\bar\alpha_j + 1) f_j\big) \circ \Psi_0. \tag{3.33}$$

Proposition 3.15. *Let conditions (3.16) and (0.36) – (0.37) be fulfilled (with fixed $\bar\alpha$). Let all f_j be disjoint. Let $T = \mu^m$ with large enough m. Then*

(i) As $(\alpha, \beta) \ne (\bar\alpha, \bar\alpha)$

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t) u_{\alpha\beta} \equiv E_{\alpha\, x} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t) u_{\bar\alpha\bar\alpha} E^t_{\beta\, y} \tag{3.34}$$
$$\forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon'\mu h \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\Omega$$

where $\Omega = B(\bar z'', C_0\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2r}_{x'',\xi''}$ is a domain in which reduction is done, $\bar z'' = (\bar x'', \bar x'')$, $E_\alpha = E_\alpha(\tau, x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$ is pdo with norm

$$\|E_\alpha\| \le C(\mu h)^{-1}\Big((\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac12|\alpha-\bar\alpha|} + e^{-|\alpha-\bar\alpha|}\omega\Big). \tag{3.35}$$

(ii) Further, $u_{\bar\alpha\bar\alpha}$ satisfies

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t)\Big(hD_t - W_{\bar\alpha}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'') - W'_{\bar\alpha}(x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')\Big) u_{\bar\alpha\bar\alpha} \equiv 0 \tag{3.36}$$
$$\forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon'\mu h \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\Omega$$

and adjoint equation with respect to y'' where $W_{\bar\alpha}$ is defined by (3.33) and $W'_{\bar\alpha}$ is pdo with symbol belonging to $(\omega + h^2)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$.

Proof. Plugging representation (3.17) into equation $\big(hD_t - A_{\mathcal{T}\,x}\big)u = 0$ and using (3.32)–(3.33), form of $\mathcal{A}$ and applying lemma 3.14 to $A_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{A}$ we arrive to system

$$\Big(hD_t - W_\alpha - W'_\alpha\Big) u_{\alpha *} \equiv \sum_{\gamma\ne\alpha} B_{\alpha\gamma}\, u_{\gamma *} \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{2r} \tag{3.37}$$

with W'_α not including hD_t. Here and below all operators are acting with respect to x''. We also get an adjoint system

$$u_{*\beta}\Big(hD_t - W_\beta - W'_\beta\Big)^t \equiv \sum_{\gamma\neq\beta} u_{*\gamma}\, B^t_{\gamma\beta} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{2r}\times\Omega \tag{3.38}$$

with operators acting with respect to y''.

Applying $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t)$ with T described above, we arrive to system

$$\Big(\tau - W_\alpha - W'_\alpha\Big)v_{\alpha *} \equiv \sum_{\gamma\neq\alpha} B_{\alpha\gamma}\, v_{\gamma *} \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{2r}, \qquad v_{\alpha\beta} = F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar\chi_T(t)v_{\alpha\beta} \tag{3.39}$$

and similar adjoint system.

Due to condition (0.36)-(0.37) for $|\tau|\le \epsilon\mu h$ all operators $\Big(\tau - W_\alpha - W'_\alpha\Big)$ with $\alpha\neq\bar\alpha$ are elliptic with inverse operator norms of magnitude $(|\alpha-\bar\alpha|\mu h)^{-1}$.

Note that even in the worst case $B_{\alpha\beta}$ are operators with symbols belonging to $\mu h(\mu^{-1}h|\alpha|)^{\frac12}\mathcal{F}^{0,1}$. Then by successive approximations $v_{\alpha *} = T_\alpha v_{\bar\alpha *}$ as $\alpha\neq\bar\alpha$ where E_α is the sum of terms of the following type:

$$(\tau - W_\alpha)^{-1}B'_{\alpha\alpha_1}(\tau - W_{\alpha_1})^{-1}B'_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}\cdots(\tau - W_{\alpha_k})^{-1}B'_{\alpha_k\bar\alpha} \tag{3.40}$$

with $k\ge 0$ where $B'_{\alpha\beta}$ are operators with symbols belonging to $\mu h(\mu^{-1}h|\alpha|)^{\frac12}\mathcal{F}^{0,1}$. Similarly, $v_{*\beta} = v_{*\bar\alpha}\,T^t_\beta$. For the sake of simplicity we included W'_α into W_α. Statement (i) follows then from these two formulae.

Plugging (3.33), (3.17) into equation $(hD_t - A_{\mathcal{T}\,x})u = 0$ and adjoint equation with respect to y, we arrive to equation similar to (3.36) (as well as adjoint equation with respect to y):

$$\Big(\tau - W_{\bar\alpha}\Big)v_{\bar\alpha *} \equiv \mathcal{W}_{\bar\alpha}v_{\bar\alpha *} \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{2r} \tag{3.41}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{\bar\alpha}$ is a sum of terms of of (3.40) type with an extra factor on their left:

$$(\mu^{-1}h)^{\frac{p}{2}}B'_{\bar\alpha\alpha}(\tau - W_\alpha)^{-1}B'_{\alpha\alpha_1}(\tau - W_{\alpha_1})^{-1}B'_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}\cdots(\tau - W_{\alpha_k})^{-1}B'_{\alpha_k\bar\alpha} \tag{3.42}$$

with $B'_{\bar\alpha\alpha}$ of the same type as above; $p=0$ here. Note that

$$(\tau - W_\alpha)^{-1} = (W_{\bar\alpha} - W_\alpha)^{-1} - (\tau - W_\alpha)^{-1}(\tau - W_{\bar\alpha})(W_{\bar\alpha} - W_\alpha)^{-1} \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{2r}. \tag{3.43}$$

We apply this formula to $(\tau - W_{\alpha_k})^{-1}$. Then we drag $(\tau - W_{\bar\alpha})$ to the right. If it dies at commuting, we get the same expression with the same k but with p replaced by $p+1$

because in commuting we gain $\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-1}h$ factor. Continuing this process with $(\tau - W_{\alpha_{k-1}})$ etc we arrive to

$$\Bigl(\tau - W_{\bar\alpha}\Bigr)v_{\bar\alpha *} \equiv \Bigl(W''_{\bar\alpha} + \mathcal{W}''_{\bar\alpha}\,(\tau - W_{\bar\alpha}) + \mathcal{W}'''_{\bar\alpha}\Bigr)v_{\bar\alpha *} \qquad \text{in } \Omega\times\mathbb{R}^{2r} \tag{3.44}$$

where $W''_{\bar\alpha}$ does not depend on τ, $\mathcal{W}'''_{\bar\alpha}$ is the sum of products of (3.42) type with p replaced by $p+1$, $\mathcal{W}''_{\bar\alpha}$ is the sum of products of (3.42) type with p replaced by $p+2$ and k replaced by $k-1$. Multiplying by $(I+\mathcal{W}''_{\bar\alpha})$ one can rewrite this equation as (3.41) with $W_{\bar\alpha}$ replaced by $W_{\bar\alpha}+W''_{\bar\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{W}'''_{\bar\alpha}$ of the same type with p replaced by $p+1$.

Continuing this process we arrive to negligible $\mathcal{W}'''_{\bar\alpha}$. Statement (ii) is proven. □

Remark 3.16. It follows from construction that modulo $(\omega+\mu^{-1}h)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$ added correction is equal to

$$W'_{\bar\alpha} = \sum_{|\alpha-\bar\alpha|=1} B_{\bar\alpha\alpha}(W_\alpha - W_{\bar\alpha})^{-1}B_{\alpha\bar\alpha} \tag{3.45}$$

with $B_{\alpha\beta}$ appearing exclusively from cubic terms in $\mathcal{A}$. Further, note that these terms are $b_{m;jk}Z^*_m Z_j Z_k$ and $b^*_{m;jk}Z_m Z^*_j Z^*_k$ with f_m not disjoint from f_j+f_k. Condition (0.36)-(0.37) implies that then $\bar\alpha_m = 0$ and either $\bar\alpha_j = 0$ or $\bar\alpha_k = 0$; therefore cubic terms, applied to $v(x'')\Upsilon_{\bar\alpha}(x')$, produce 0, and therefore $W'_{\bar\alpha}\in(\omega+\mu^{-1}h)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}$.

However, correction $W'_{\bar\alpha}\equiv h^2\sum_j \kappa_j Z^*_j Z_j \mod O(\omega+\mu^{-1}h)$ is already generated in the process of reduction in section 2. Still we see that it 0 in the case of constant g^{jk}, F_{jk}.

(ii) Consider now a more general case when some of f_j are not disjoint; assume that f_j is disjoint from the rest of eigenvalues as $j=1,\dots,p$ and is not as $j=p+1,\dots,r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_0 = \sum_{1\le j\le p} b_j(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\bigl(\mu^2x_j^2+h^2D_j^2\bigr)+\\ \sum_{p+1\le j,k\le r} b_{jk}(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\bigl(Z^*_jZ_k+\mu h\delta_{jk}\bigr)+b_0(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

Note that condition (0.36)-(0.37) yields that $\bar\alpha_j=0$ as $j\ge p+1$ and thus $\mathcal{A}_0$ restricted to $v(x'')\Upsilon_{\bar\alpha}(x')$ equals

$$\mathcal{A}_0 = \sum_{1\le j\le p} b_j(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'')\bigl(2\bar\alpha_j+1\bigr);+b_0(x'',\mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{3.47}$$

then arguments of the proof of proposition 3.15 still work but instead of individual subspaces $\mathcal{H}_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigl\{v(x'')\Upsilon_\alpha(x')\bigr\}$ for $\alpha=(\alpha';\alpha'')=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_p;\alpha_{p+1},\dots,\alpha_r)$ one should consider $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha',n}\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\bigl\{\sum_{|\alpha''|=n} v_{(\alpha';\alpha'')}(x'')\,\Upsilon_{(\alpha';\alpha'')}(x')\bigr\}$.

Therefore we have

Proposition 3.17. *Proposition 3.15 holds even if f_i are not necessary disjoint.*

3.3.5 Ultrastrong magnetic field case. End

First of all standard elliptic arguments applied to equation (3.36) yield that under condition (0.41) $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)u_{\alpha\beta}\equiv 0$ as $\tau\le\epsilon'$ and therefore

Proposition 3.18. *Let conditions (3.16) and (0.36) – (0.37) be fulfilled (with fixed $\bar{\alpha}$). Let $T=\mu^m$ with large enough m. Then under condition (0.41) on* $\operatorname{supp}\psi$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\psi(x)u|\le C\mu^{-s}\qquad \forall\tau:|\tau|\le\epsilon'. \tag{3.48}$$

Proposition 3.19. *Let conditions (3.16) and (0.36) – (0.37) be fulfilled (with fixed $\bar{\alpha}$).*

(i) Let ϕ_1 be supported in $B(0,1)$, $\phi_2=1$ in $B(0,2)$, χ be supported in $[-1,1]$, $Q_k=\phi_{k,M\mu^{-1}T}(x''-\bar{x}'',\xi''_x-\bar{\xi}'')^{\mathrm{w}}$. Then for $T_0\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}C\varepsilon^{-1}|\log\mu|\le T\le T_1'=C_0T_0'$ and large enough constant M estimate (3.7) holds.

(ii) Let $\psi_k=\phi_{k,M\mu^{-1}T}(x-\bar{x})$. Then for $T_0'\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}C(\mu h|\log\mu|)^{\frac12}\le T\le T_1=\epsilon\mu_0T$ and large enough constant M and large enough constant M

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\big(1-\phi_2(x)\big)u(x,y,t)\phi_1(y)|\le C\mu^{-s}\qquad\forall\tau\le c. \tag{3.49}$$

Proof. For $\alpha=\beta=\bar{\alpha}$ statement (i) follows immediately from (3.36) by standard propagation method. Then (3.34) implies (i) for all α,β. Then the similar statement is true for $u_{\mathcal{T}}$.

It implies (3.49) for $T_0'\le T\le T_1'$; so $\phi(hD_t)\mathbf{U}(t)\psi_1\equiv\phi(hD_t)\psi_2\mathbf{U}(T)\psi_1$ as $T_0\le t\le T_1'$. In the general case let $n=\lfloor t/T\rfloor$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(hD_t)\mathbf{U}(t)\psi_1&\equiv\mathbf{U}(t-T)\psi_2\mathbf{U}(T)\psi_1\equiv\dots\\ &\equiv\phi(hD_t)\psi_n\mathbf{U}(t-nT)\psi_{n-1}\mathbf{U}(T)\psi_{n-2}\cdots\psi_2\mathbf{U}(T)\psi_1\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

where ψ_{k+1} is supported in $2M\mu^{-1}T$-vicinity of $\operatorname{supp}\psi_k$ and equal to 1 in in $M\mu^{-1}T$-vicinity of $\operatorname{supp}\psi_k$. Then $(1-\psi_{n+2})\phi(hD_t)\mathbf{U}(t)\psi_1\equiv 0$ which is a statement (ii). □

The same arguments lead to

Proposition 3.20. *Let conditions (3.16) and (0.36) – (0.37) be fulfilled (with fixed $\bar{\alpha}$). Then*

(i) Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 which is equivalent now to

$$\ell(W_{\bar{\alpha}})\ge\epsilon_0-C|\mathrm{W}_{\bar{\alpha}}| \tag{3.51}$$

be fulfilled. Let $Q_1=\phi_{1,\epsilon}(x''-\bar{x}'',\xi''-\bar{\xi}'')^{\mathrm{w}}$ and

$$Q_2=\varpi\Big(\mu T^{-1}(\langle\ell',x''-\bar{x}''\rangle+\langle\ell',x''-\bar{x}''x''-\bar{x}''\rangle)+T^{-1}\epsilon't\Big)^{\mathrm{w}} \tag{3.52}$$

with our standard function ϖ. Then for $T \in [T_0, T_1']$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\big(1-Q_{2x}\big)u_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t)Q^t_{1,y}| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau \le \epsilon'. \tag{3.53}$$

(ii) Further, for $\psi_1 = \phi_{1,\epsilon}(x-\bar{x})$ and $\psi_2 = \varpi\big(\mu T^{-1}\langle \ell, x-\bar{x}\rangle + T^{-1}\epsilon' t\big)$ with $T \in [T_0', T_1]$. the following estimate holds

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\big(1-\phi_2(x)\big)u(x,y,t)\phi_1(y)| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau \le \epsilon'. \tag{3.54}$$

Corollary 3.21. *Under conditions (3.16), (0.36) – (0.37) and condition 0.2*

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma u\phi_1| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon' \tag{3.55}$$

holds for $T \in [T_0, T_1]$. In particular,

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\big(\bar{\chi}_T(t) - \bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t)\big)\Gamma u\phi_1| \le C\mu^{-s} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon'. \tag{3.56}$$

Furthermore, for $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ one can prove easily that singularities propagate along trajectories

$$\frac{dx_j}{dt} = \mu^{-1}\sum_k f^{jk}\partial_{x_k}V_{\bar{\alpha}}, \qquad V_{\bar{\alpha}} = \sum_j f_j(2\bar{\alpha}_j + 1) + V) \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon' \tag{3.57}$$

where $(f^{jk}) = (F_{jk})^{-1}$ but we do not need it. In particular, $V_{\bar{\alpha}}$ is an integral. For $d = 2$ even condition $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ is not necessary.

3.4 Propagation. V. Conclusion

So, under our assumptions to smoothness and microhyperbolicity and choice of ε we considered cases

(a) $\epsilon h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le \mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$;

(b) $\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$;

(c) $\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$;

(d) $\epsilon h^{-1} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$;

(e) $\mu \ge \epsilon h^{-1}$ and g^{jk}, F_{jk} are constant;

(f) $\mu \ge Ch^{-1}$ and condition (0.36)-(0.37) is fulfilled;

and proved (3.55),(3.56), for $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log\mu|$ and $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$ (unless $(l,\sigma) \prec (2,0)$, and $\#|\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$ which is possible in cases (a)–(c) only, when $T_1 = \epsilon\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{\sigma}$). In cases (a)–(c) we knew from section 1 similar result with T_0' instead of T_0 and therefore we needed only to consider $T \in [T_0, T_0']$ here; in cases (d)–(f) we had no help from section 1.

4 Short-range propagation and Estimates

4.1 Goals

Still, $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ is too large. Really, Tauberian method gives us remainder estimate

$$\frac{1}{T}\sup_{|\tau|\le\epsilon}|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)| \tag{4.1}$$

while the principal part is

$$\frac{1}{h}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau. \tag{4.2}$$

We will reduce (4.2) to more explicit form in the next section (where this section approach will be crucial as well) but now let us consider (4.1). To decrease it one should increase T but generally supremum also grows proportionally T and there is no improvement; the following estimate

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)| \le CT\Bigl(h^{-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r}\Bigr) \qquad \forall \tau\le c \tag{4.3}$$

rather easily follows from

$$|\phi(hD_t)\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)| \le C\Bigl(h^{-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r}\Bigr). \tag{4.4}$$

However results of the previous section shows that while taking $T=T_1$ one can take $\bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t)$ and then (4.1) becomes $CT_0T_1^{-1}\bigl(h^{-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r}\bigr)$. It equals to our dream remainder estimate as $T_0=T_0^*\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}Ch$. Note that even in the smooth case T_0 is larger[21)]. We cannot just take $T_0=T_0^*$ because $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)$ is not negligible for $T\in[T_0^*,T_0]$; instead our goal is to prove under microhyperbolicity condition that

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\chi_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)| \le CT\Bigl(h^{-2r}+\mu^r h^{-r}\Bigr)\times (\frac{h}{T})^l|\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau|\le\epsilon'. \tag{4.5}$$

As $(l,\sigma)\succ(1,1)$ it would imply that left-hand expression of (4.3) with $T=T_0'$ does not exceeds its right-hand expression with $T=T_0^*$.

[21)] Since "no mollifications needed" has its own pitfalls, we would need actually request $T_0'=h^{1-\delta}$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta>0$ rather than $T_0=Ch|\log h|$.

To achieve this goal we apply η-mollification to $A_{\mathcal{T}}$; this will lead to approximation error in $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bigl(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma u\psi\bigr)$ which we are going to estimate and to (kind of) negligibility estimate of it after mollification. Minimizing the sum by η (which will depend on T) we will arrive to (4.5) for non-mollified operator (surely, the original mollification will be still here).

4.2 Pilot-Model: some classes of pdos

We start from related simple results (we will need them anyway):

Proposition 4.1. *Let $A = A(x, hD)$ be a (matrix) self-adjoint h-pdo in $\mathbb{R}^r$ with symbol $a \in \mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ and satisfying microhyperbolicity condition on level $\tau = 0$:*

$$\langle (\ell a)v, v\rangle \ge \epsilon\|v\|^2 - C\|(a-\tau)v\|^2 \qquad \forall v \quad \forall (x,\xi). \tag{4.6}$$

Let u be a Schwartz kernel of $e^{-ih^{-1}A}$. Let ψ be supported in the small vicinity of 0.

(i) Let $l > 1$. Then for $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$ and small enough constant T_0

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^\dagger)| \le Ch^{-r}\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^{l-1}\bigl(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\bigr)^{-s}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}, \tag{4.7}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^\dagger)| \le Ch^{1-r}\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^{l-1}\bigl(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\bigr)^{-s}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon \tag{4.8}$$

with arbitrarily large exponent s.

(ii) Let $l = 1, \sigma \ge 2$. Then for $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$ and small enough constant T_0

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^\dagger)| \le Ch^{-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\bigl(1+\frac{T\varepsilon}{h}\bigr)^{-s} + Ch^{-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^\dagger)| \le Ch^{1-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\bigl(1+\frac{T\varepsilon}{h}\bigr)^{-s} + Ch^{1-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s} \tag{4.10}$$

as $\tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon$ with arbitrarily large exponent s.

Pilot-model. Before actual proof, let us start with a simple example (actually arising as $d = 2$ [22]):

[22] In this case one can apply successive approximations on this stage and to arrive to oscillatory integral expression

In the case of scalar operator $\mathrm{Tr}(u\psi)$ is something like $h^{-d}I_1$ with $I_1 = \int e^{ih^{-1}\lambda(z)t}q(z)\,dz$ and the second expression is $h^{1-d}I_2$ with $I_2 = h^{-1}\iint \chi(t/T)e^{ih^{-1}\lambda(z)t}q(z)\,dz\,dt$. I consider case $T \le \varepsilon^{-1}h$, $l > 1$.

Replacing λ by its η-mollification we make an error $O\big(\vartheta(\eta)\big)$ in λ which leads to error $O\big(Th^{-1}\vartheta(\eta)\big)$ in I_1. In the same time (multiple) integration by parts with respect to t shows that the error in I_2 is does not exceed

$$Ch^{-2}T^2\int (Th^{-1}|\lambda-\tau|+1)^{-2}\,dz \times \vartheta(\eta) \le Ch^{-1}T\vartheta(\eta). \tag{4.11}$$

Consider now I_1 and I_2 with mollified λ assuming that $|\partial_{z_1}\lambda| \ge \epsilon$. Multiple integration by part with respect to z_1 will transform modified I_1 into $\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^k\int e^{ih^{-1}\lambda(z)t}q_k(z)\,dz$ where $q_k = O\big(\eta^{-k-1}\vartheta(\eta)\big)$ as k is large enough and therefore modified I_1 is $O\Big(\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^k\eta^{-k-1}\vartheta(\eta)\Big)$.

We can treat I_2 in the similar way, but we add integration by parts with respect to t as well and use of nondegeneracy condition as above. Then modified I_2 has the same upper estimate.

Therefore both original I_1 and I_2 do not not exceed $CTh^{-1}\vartheta(\eta)+\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^k\eta^{-k-1}\vartheta(\eta)$. Picking (near) optimal $\eta = h/T$ we get estimates $|I_k| \le C\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{-1}\vartheta\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)$. It proves (4.7), (4.8) in this special case.

Proof. [23] (I) Note first that due to standard propagation results for $T \ge Ch\varepsilon^{-1}|\log h|$ left-hand expressions in (4.7), (4.8) are negligible. Thus we need to consider only $T \le T_1 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} Ch\varepsilon^{-1}|\log h|$. We can consider χ supported in $[\frac12, 1]$ and until the end of the proof t, T_k are positive.

Consider η-mollification A_η of operator A with respect to (x,ξ) [24]:

$$1 \gg \eta \ge \varepsilon. \tag{4.12}$$

. Then the error in the operator (the difference between A_η and A) will not exceed $C\vartheta(\eta)$ in the sense that

$$\|(A_\eta - A)\| \le C\vartheta(\eta) \tag{4.13}$$

and identity

$$e^{ih^{-1}tA} = e^{ih^{-1}tA_\eta} + ih^{-1}\int_0^t e^{ih^{-1}(t-t')A}(A-A_\eta)e^{ih^{-1}t'A_\eta}\,dt' \tag{4.14}$$

[23] Of proposition 4.1.

[24] It means that we mollify its Weyl symbol; I remind that original symbol is regular in ε-scale.

implies that

$$\|\Big(e^{ih^{-1}tA}-e^{ih^{-1}tA_\eta}\Big)\| \le CTh^{-1}\vartheta(\eta) \qquad \text{as } |t|\le T, \tag{4.15}$$

$$|\chi_T(t)\Gamma\big((u_\eta-u)\psi_y^\dagger\big)| \le Ch^{-d-1}T\vartheta(\eta) \tag{4.16}$$

for standard cut-off ψ in $B(\big(\bar{x},\bar{\xi}\big),1\big)\subset\mathbb{R}^{2r}_{(x,\xi)}$; this is exactly what we got in pilot-model.

On the other hand, microhyperbolicity condition (4.6) and theorem 3.1 of [BrIvr] imply that $\phi(hD_t)\big(\chi_T(t)\Gamma u_\eta\psi_y^\dagger\big)$ is negligible provided

$$h^\delta \ge \eta \ge ChT^{-1}|\log h| \tag{4.17}$$

(and $\operatorname{supp}\phi\subset[-\epsilon,\epsilon]$) and picking minimal $\eta = ChT^{-1}|\log h|$ we arrive to inequality

$$|\phi(hD_t)\Gamma\chi_T(t)u\psi| \le Ch^{-d}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}\cdot|\log h|^{l-\sigma} \tag{4.18}$$

due to $T\ge h^{1-\delta}$. This inequality is almost as good as (4.7): we have an extra factor $|\log h|^l$ in the right-hand expression.

(II) To get gid of this factor we need more delicate analysis. First, let us iterate (4.14):

$$\begin{aligned} e^{ih^{-1}tA} = e^{ih^{-1}tA_\eta}\sum_{0\le p\le m-1}\frac{1}{p!}i^p h^{-p}\int_{\Delta_p} e^{ih^{-1}(t-t_1-\dots-t_p)A_\eta}(A-A_\eta)\times \\ e^{ih^{-1}t_1A_\eta}(A-A_\eta)\cdots(A-A_\eta)e^{ih^{-1}t_pA_\eta}\,dt_1\cdots dt_p + R_m \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

with the remainder

$$\begin{aligned} R_m = \frac{1}{m!}i^m h^{-m}\int_{\Delta_m} e^{ih^{-1}(t-t_1-\dots-t_m)A_\eta}(A-A_\eta)\times \\ e^{ih^{-1}t_1A_\eta}(A-A_\eta)\cdots(A-A_\eta)e^{ih^{-1}t_mA}\,dt_1\cdots dt_m. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Then the remainder trace norm does not exceed $C\big(Th^{-1}\vartheta(\eta)\big)^m h^{-d}$ and it is less than the right-hand expression of (4.7) for large enough m (because we gain factor $(h/T)^{l-1}|\log(h/T)|^{l-\sigma}$ on each step).

Now as we take $p=1$ we need to consider

$$e^{ith^{-1}A_\eta}\big(ih^{-1}t(A-A_\eta)\big)\psi. \tag{4.21}$$

Without any loss of the generality one can assume that direction of microhyperbolicity is $\ell=\partial_{\xi_1}$. Let us apply ϵT-admissible partition with respect to x_1: $\psi'=\psi'\sum_\nu\varphi_k(x_1)$. Here and below φ (with different indices) are ϵT-admissible functions.

Due to (4.17) logarithmic uncertainty principle $T\times\eta\ge C'h|\log h|$ holds and therefore due to microhyperbolicity $\varphi_\nu e^{ith^{-1}A}\equiv \varphi_\nu e^{ith^{-1}A}\tilde\varphi_\nu$ (modulo operator, negligible after cut-off $\phi(hD_t)$) as $\frac12 T\le t\le T$ where distance between $\operatorname{supp}\tilde\varphi_\nu$ and $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_\nu$ is exactly of magnitude $\mu^{-1}T$. Then to prove (4.7) it is sufficient to estimate properly a trace norm of $\sum_\nu \tilde\varphi_\nu B\psi\varphi'_\nu\times(\frac{h}{T})^{-1}$. To do this it would be enough to prove that

(4.22) The operator norm of each "sandwich" $\tilde\varphi_\nu B\psi'\varphi_\nu$ does not exceed

$$M\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}(\frac{h}{T})^l\big(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\big)^{-s}|\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma}.$$

Really, then the trace norm of each "sandwich" will be $CTh^{-r}\times M_k$ where T is x_1-size of $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_\nu$, After summation with respect to ν factor T disappears and we estimate trace norm of (4.21) (after $\phi(hD_t)$ cut-off) by $h^{-r}M\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{-1}$, which implies (4.7), (4.9).

For $p\ge 2$ we replace the integral over Δ_p by the sum of integrals over $\Delta_p\cap\{|t_j-\bar t_j|\le \epsilon' T, j=1,\dots,p\}$ with very small constants ϵ'. We also place partitions elements around each copy of the operator exponent, so $e^{ih^{-1}t_jA_\eta}$ is now replaced by $\varphi_{\nu_{2j}}e^{ih^{-1}t_jA_\eta}\varphi_{\nu_{2j+1}}$, $t_0=t-t_1-\dots-t_p$. Then either supports of $\varphi_{\nu_{2j+1}}$ and $\phi_{\nu_{2j+2}}$ are disjoint by a distance at least $\epsilon\mu^{-1}T$ for some j and we have a sandwich $\varphi_{\nu_{2j+1}}B\varphi_{\nu_{2j+2}}$ of the type described in (4.22), or supports of φ_{ν_0} and $\varphi_{\nu_{2p+1}}$ are disjoint by a distance at least $\epsilon\mu^{-1}T$ (and then after taking trace we get negligible term) or $\varphi_{\nu_{2j}}e^{ih^{-1}t_jA_\eta}\varphi_{\nu_{2j+1}}$ is negligible operator.

Since any sandwich has a norm not exceeding $C\eta^l|\log\eta|^{-\sigma}$ and is accompanied by a factor $\frac{T}{h}$, it brings as a result factor $\big(\frac{T}{h}\big)^{l-1}|\log\big(\frac{T}{h}\big)|^{l-\sigma}$.

To estimate the norm of a sandwich of (2.22)-type let us consider the sequence of mollifications A_ρ with $\rho=\rho_n=2^n\rho_0$, $\rho_0=\max\big(\big(\frac{h}{T}\big),\varepsilon\big)$ and $n=1,2,\dots,\bar n$ such that $\rho_{\bar n+1}=\eta$. Then operator $B=\sum_{0\le n\le\bar n}B_n$ with $B_n=A_{\rho_n}-A_{\rho_{n+1}}$ has a $\vartheta(\rho)\mathcal{F}^{0,0}_\rho$ symbol with $(\rho\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\rho_n$. Then the norm of the sandwich $\tilde\varphi_\nu B_n\varphi_\nu$ does not exceed $C\vartheta(\rho)\times(h/T\rho)^s$ with arbitrarily large s and summation with respect to n does not exceed the same expression with $\rho=\rho_0=h/T$; so we get $\vartheta(\frac{h}{T})\big(1+\frac{T\varepsilon}{h}\big)^{-s}$ which is exactly M s defined in (4.22).

Thus (4.7), (4.9) are proven.

(III) To prove (4.8) consider first case $l>1$. Then plugging (4.19)–(4.20) we see that for large enough m we can skip R_m. Also we can skip term with $p=0$ because it involves only η-admissible operators. Applying the above arguments we need to estimate

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma v_p\psi_y^\dagger)| \tag{4.23}$$

with v_p a Schwartz kernel of the term in (4.19) with the same notations as above. Let us

consider $p=1$ first. One can see easily that

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\chi_T(t)e^{ith^{-1}A_\eta}\Big) = \tag{4.24}$$
$$(2\pi)^{-1}\int \chi_T(t)e^{ith^{-1}(A_\eta-\tau)}\,dt =$$
$$(2\pi)^{-1}\int \chi_T(t)\big(-h^2\partial_t^2+\gamma^2\big)^q e^{ith^{-1}(A_\eta-\tau)}\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\,dt =$$
$$(2\pi)^{-1}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^q\int \chi_{(q),T}(t)e^{ith^{-1}(A_\eta-\tau)}\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\,dt$$

with $\chi_{(q)}(t)=(-\partial_t+\gamma^2T^2h^{-2})^q\chi(t)$. Let us pick up $\gamma=\rho_0$.

Let us multiply (4.24) from the left by φ'_ν which is equal to 1 in ϵT-vicinity of $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_\nu$. Then modulo negligible we can multiply it from the right by $\tilde\varphi_\nu$ which is equal to 0 in ϵT-vicinity of $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_\nu$:

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\chi_T(t)\varphi'_\nu\, e^{ith^{-1}A_\eta}\Big)\equiv \tag{4.25}$$
$$(2\pi)^{-1}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^q\int \chi_{(q),T}(t)\varphi'_\nu\, e^{ith^{-1}(A_\eta-\tau)}\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\tilde\varphi_\nu\,dt$$

and therefore

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Big(\chi_T(t)\varphi'_\nu\, e^{ith^{-1}A_\eta}\Big)B\varphi_\nu\equiv \tag{4.26}$$
$$(2\pi)^{-1}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^q\int \chi_{(q),T}(t)\varphi'_\nu\, e^{ith^{-1}(A_\eta-\tau)}\tilde\varphi_\nu\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\tilde\varphi'_\nu\cdot\underbrace{\tilde\varphi_\nu B\varphi_\nu}_{\text{sandwich}}\,dt$$

where the origin of both factors $\tilde\varphi'_\nu$ is clear: the first one is again due to propagation and the second one is just taken of $\tilde\varphi_\nu$.

Note that $\chi_{(q)}$ is a function bounded by $C\big(1+\frac{\varepsilon T}{h}\big)^{2q}$. We already proved that the operator norm of "sandwich" does not exceed $C\gamma^{lp}|\log h|^{-p\sigma}\big(1+\frac{\varepsilon T}{h}\big)^{-s}$ and therefore (4.8) for term with $p=1$ follows from estimate

$$\sum_\nu \|\tilde\varphi'_\nu\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\tilde\varphi'_\nu\|_1\le Ch^{-r}\gamma^{1-2q} \tag{4.27}$$

where $\|.\|_1$ means trace norm.

(IV) Let us prove (4.27). Because operator is positive, its left-hand expression does not exceed

$$\operatorname{Tr}\Big(\big((A_\eta-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}\psi\Big). \tag{4.28}$$

Let us consider γ-admissible partition; I remind that $\gamma \ge \varepsilon$. Because in $B(z,\gamma)$ with $z=(x,\xi)$ variation of symbol of A_η does not exceed $C\gamma$, we conclude that (4.29) does not exceed

$$Ch^{-r}\int_{\mathcal{D}} \mathrm{Tr}'\big((a(z)-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-s}\,dz = C\mu^{-r}h^r\int_{\mathcal{D}}\sum_J \big((\omega_J-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-s}\,dz \tag{4.29}$$

where $a(z)$ is a (matrix) symbol of A_η and Tr' means a (matrix) trace, ω_J are eigenvalues of a (in order) and integrals are taken over bounded domain in $\mathcal{D}\subset \mathbb{R}^{2r}_{x'',\xi''}$.

Then (4.27) follows from

$$\int (|\omega_j(z)-\tau|+\gamma)^{-q}\,dz \le C\gamma^{1-2q} \tag{4.30}$$

as $q>\frac{1}{2}$ which, in turn, follows from microhyperbolicity. Really, without any loss of the generality one can assume that $\ell=\partial_{z_1}$. Then uniformly with respect to $z'=(z_2,\dots,z_d)$ $\epsilon\le \partial_{z_1}\omega_j\le C$ which instantly yields that even if we restrict ourselves by integral over z_1, (4.31) still holds.

So, *for term with $p=1$ estimate (4.8) is proven.* For $p\ge 2$ we need to modify our trace trick. Consider $(p+1)$-dimensional integrals representing corresponding terms

$$(2\pi)^{-1}h^{-p}\int_{\{t\ge t_1+\dots+t_p\}} \chi_T(t)e^{ih^{-1}\left((t-t_1-\dots-t_p)A_\eta-t\tau\right)}B\times \\ e^{it_1h^{-1}A_\eta}B\cdots Be^{it_kh^{-1}A_\eta}\,dt_1\cdots dt_p\,dt. \tag{4.31}$$

Replacing

$$e^{ih^{-1}\left((t-t_1-\dots-t_p)A_\eta-t\tau\right)} = (-h^2\partial_t^2+\gamma^2)(A_\eta^2+\gamma^2)^{-1}e^{ih^{-1}\left((t-t_1-\dots-t_p)A_\eta-t\tau\right)}$$

and integrating once by parts with respect to t we gain factor $(h/T)^2\big((A_\eta-\eta)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-1}$ with χ, replaced by $\chi_{(1)}=(-\partial_t^2+h^{-2}T^2\gamma^2)\chi$, but we also get new terms

$$ch^{1-p}\int \chi_T(t_1+\dots+t_p)\big((A_\eta-\eta)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-1}e^{-ih^{-1}t\tau}Be^{it_1h^{-1}A_\eta}B\cdots\times \\ Be^{it_ph^{-1}A_\eta}\,dt_1\cdots dt_p \tag{4.32}$$

and may be

$$ch^{2-p}\int \chi_T(t_1+\dots+t_{p-1})\big((A_\eta-\eta)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-1}e^{-ih^{-1}t\tau}Be^{it_1h^{-1}A_\eta}B\cdots\times \\ Be^{it_{p-1}h^{-1}A_\eta}\,dt_1\cdots dt_{p-1}. \tag{4.33}$$

with some other functions χ. These new terms are just lesser-dimensional integrals of the same type. As before we frame operator exponents by φ_* functions before applying this trick.

(V) Now let $l = 1$, $\sigma > 1$. We need to consider R_m and generated by its expression which is $(m+1)$-dimensional integral

$$(2\pi)^{-1}h^{-m}\int_{\{t\ge t_1+\cdots+t_m\}} \chi_T(t)e^{ih^{-1}\left((t-t_1-\cdots-t_m)A_\eta - t\tau\right)}B\times e^{it_1h^{-1}A_\eta}B\cdots Be^{it_mh^{-1}A}\,dt_1\cdots dt_m\,dt. \tag{4.34}$$

We treat it in the same way as before, but in the end we apply estimate

$$\|(A_\eta+i\gamma)^{-1}\psi\|_1 \le Ch^{-r}\begin{cases}\gamma^{1-q} & \text{as } q>1,\\ |\log\gamma| & \text{as } q=1,\end{cases} \tag{4.35}$$

which is proven the same way (but simpler) as (4.27) we see that it does not exceed $Ch^{1-r}\bigl(\eta|\log h|^{-\sigma}Th^{-1}\bigr)^m|\log h| = Ch^{1-r}|\log h|^{m(1-\sigma)+1}$ as $T\ge h^{1-\delta}$; for large m it is less than the right-hand expression in (4.10).

Further, one can treat m-dimensional integral (4.33) in the same way. So, *estimates (4.8), (4.10) are proven completely*. □

4.3 Case of intermediate magnetic field

So, assuming that $\mu_1^* = \epsilon h^{-\frac12}|\log h|^{-\frac12} \le \mu \le \mu_2^* = \epsilon h^{-1}|\log|^{-1}$ we consider

$$T : h^{1-\delta} \le T \le T_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C\mu h|\log h| \tag{4.36}$$

with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$. Note that we need to consider only $T \ge T_0^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon_0\mu^{-1}$ because for $|t| \le T_0^*$ standard theory takes place. Another restriction from below will appear later.

Proposition 4.2. *Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled. Let ϕ be supported in the small vicinity of 0.*

(i) Let $l > 1$. Then for $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi)| \le Ch^{-d}\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^{l-1}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\bigl(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\bigr)^{-s}, \tag{4.37}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi)| \le Ch^{-d}\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^{l-1}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\bigl(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\bigr)^{-s} \tag{4.38}$$

with arbitrarily large exponent s.

(ii) Let $l = 1, \sigma \ge 2$. Then for $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$ estimates

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi)| \le Ch^{-d}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\big(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\big)^{-s} + Ch^{-d}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s}, \tag{4.39}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi)| \le Ch^{-d}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\big(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\big)^{-s} + Ch^{1-d}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s} \tag{4.40}$$

$\forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon$ *with arbitrarily large exponent s.*

Proof. As in subsection 4.2, we can consider χ supported in $[\frac12, 1]$ and in what follows t, T_k are positive.

Consider η-mollification $\mathcal{A}_\eta$ of operator $A_\mathcal{T}$ with respect to x'', ξ'' with η satisfying (4.12). Then the error in operator (difference between A_η and A) will not exceed $C\eta^l|\log\eta|^{-s}$ in the sense that

$$\|(A_\eta - A)v\| \le C\eta^l|\log\eta|^{-s}\Big(\|Av\| + \|v\|\Big), \tag{4.41}$$

and then we just follow the proof of proposition 4.1 with the following modifications:

(i) we consider $\mu^{-1}h$-pdos with respect to x'' with "matrix" symbols a; furthermore, factor and $(\mu h)^{-r}$ comes from the "matrix" trace.

(ii) Between different copies of $\mathcal{B}$ we place not only $\varphi_{(\lambda)\nu j}$ but also Q'_j where Q'_j are cut-offs with respect to (x', ξ') (keeping all in zone $\{|x'| + |\xi'| \le C\mu^{-1}\}$ (and also $a_\mathfrak{n}$ in vicinity of $\tau_\mathfrak{n}$ for all $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathfrak{N}$).

(iii) We remember that $\psi_\mathcal{T} = \psi(x', \mu^{-1}D'; x'', \mu^{-1}hD'')$ with $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$ symbol and we need to mollify ψ as well. Then there will be either $\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta}$ or $(\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta} - \psi_\mathcal{T})$ factor; in the latter case it is possible that it is the only factor containing difference. In the former case we follow subsection 4.1, in the latter case we just note that the norm of $(\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta} - \psi_\mathcal{T})$ is $O(\eta^l|\log\eta|^{-\sigma})$ exactly as in $(A_{\mathcal{T}\eta} - A_\mathcal{T})$ but this time it is not accompanied by rather large factor T/h and this makes things much more comfortable. □

Then summing over partition of $[-T_0, T_0] \setminus [T_0^*, T_0^*]$ we get immediately inequality

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\big(\bar\chi_{T_0}(t) - \bar\chi_{T_0}(t)\big)\Gamma(u\psi)| \le Ch^{1-d}. \tag{4.42}$$

Really, the left-hand expression here does not exceed the right-hand expression of (4.37) integrated over $\frac{dT}{T}$ from T_0^* to T_0 which, in turn, does not exceed Ch^{1-d}; contribution of

extra term (4.39) as $l = 1$ does not exceed Ch^{1-d} as well. On the other hand, we know from rescaling of the standard results that (for $\mu \le h^{-1}$)

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(u\psi)| \le Ch^{1-d} \tag{4.43}$$

as $T = T_0^*$ and therefore it holds for $T = T_0$ and it follows from section 1, that (4.43) holds for $T = T_1$. I remind that $T_1 = \epsilon\mu$ as either $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ or $(l,\sigma) \succeq (2,0)$ and $T_1 = \epsilon\mu^{l-1}|\log\mu|^\sigma$ otherwise.

Then standard Tauberian arguments imply immediately

Corollary 4.3. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 and $\mu \le h^{\delta-1}$ estimate (1.62) holds.*

In the general case we will need analysis of section 5 to prove this statement. Anyway, we need it to get more explicit formula than (1.62) provides.

4.4 Case of strong magnetic field

I remind that then $\mu_2^* = \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu_4^* = C_0h^{-1}$ and $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ where either $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ and

$$\varepsilon \ge C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}, \tag{4.44}$$

or $\#\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$ and

$$\varepsilon \ge C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}e^{C\mu h|\log h|} \tag{4.45}$$

and in the latter case $\mu \le \mu_3^* = \epsilon_1 h^{-1}$.

In this strong magnetic field case we can apply the same arguments combined with propositions 3.7–3.9 and extend proposition 4.2:

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1} \le \mu \le \epsilon_1 h^{-1}$, $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ and either $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ and (4.44) hold or $\#\mathfrak{N} \ge 2$ and (4.45) hold.*

Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 be fulfilled and let $T \in [h^{1-\delta}, T_0]$. Then both statements (i),(ii) of proposition 4.2 remain true.

Proof. Just repeating proof of proposition 4.2 without significant difference. We use that in operator sense $|x'| + |\xi''| \le C\mu^{-1}$ still even if in microlocal sense one should put $C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$ instead. □

4.5 Case of superstrong magnetic field

This case is split again into two subcases: $\mu_3^* = \epsilon_1 h^{-1} \le \mu \le \mu_4^* = C_0h^{-1}$ and $\mu \ge \mu_4^* = C_0h^{-1}$.

4.5.1 Case of not-ultrastrong magnetic field

As before case $\epsilon_1 h^{-1} \le \mu \le ch^{-1}$ is just a variation of strong magnetic field case but with mandatory $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ and microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 instead of 0.1. Using the same arguments as in the proof of proposition 4.2 we arrive to

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\epsilon h^{-1} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$, $\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$ and $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$.*

Let microhyperbolicity condition 0.2 be fulfilled and let $T \in [h^{1-\delta}, T_0]$. Then both statements (i),(ii) of proposition 4.2 remain true.

4.5.2 Case of ultrastrong magnetic field

We need to assume now that either g^{jk}, F_{jk} are constant or conditions (0.36)–(0.37) are fulfilled. Exactly the same method as before leads us to similar results:

Proposition 4.6. *Let $\mu \ge C_0 h^{-1}$, $\varepsilon = (\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$, $T_0 = C\varepsilon^{-1}h|\log h|$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$. Let either g^{jk}, F_{jk} are constant and microhyperbolicity condition (0.19) be fulfilled or conditions (0.36)–(0.37) and microhyperbolicity condition (0.38) be fulfilled.*

(i) Let $l > 1$. Then for $T \in [C\mu^{\delta}h, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^{\dagger})| \le C\mu^r h^{-r}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}\big(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\big)^{-s}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}, \tag{4.46}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^{\dagger})| \le C\mu^r h^{1-r}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}\big(1+\frac{h}{T\varepsilon}\big)^{-s}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma} \tag{4.47}$$

as $|\tau| \le \epsilon$ with arbitrarily large exponent s.

(ii) Let $l = 1, \sigma \ge 2$. Then for $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T_0]$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$ and small enough constant T_0

$$|\phi(hD_t)\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^{\dagger})| \le C\mu^r h^{-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\big(1+\frac{T\varepsilon}{h}\big)^{-s} + C\mu^r h^{-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s}, \tag{4.48}$$

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)(\Gamma u\psi_y^{\dagger})| \le C\mu^r h^{1-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-\sigma}\big(1+\frac{T\varepsilon}{h}\big)^{-s} + C\mu^r h^{1-r}|\log\frac{h}{T}|^{-s} \tag{4.49}$$

as $|\tau| \le \epsilon$ with arbitrarily large exponent s.

5 Successful approximation and calculations.

In this section we will replace rather implicit formula (0.48) by a more explicit one and we finish the proof of the crucial inequality

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\Gamma\bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t)u\psi| \le Ch^{1-2r} + C\mu^r h^{1-r}. \tag{5.1}$$

Our tool will be method of successive approximations on rather short interval $[-T_0, T_0]$.

5.1 Preliminary remarks

Now even if we have a remainder estimate proven in some cases (see 4.3) but its principal part is given by rather implicit formula (0.48) which is transformed into

$$h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Big(e^{ih^{-1}tA_{\mathcal{T}}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\Big)\Big)\,d\tau \tag{5.2}$$

with $T = T_1$ which can be replaced by $T = T_0$ (see below) because their difference is negligible and $\psi_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}^*\psi\mathcal{T}$. We cannot take $T = T_0^*$ here.

Surely, microhyperbolicity condition is fulfilled only at levels close to 0 but we do not need it otherwise. Really, let us decompose expression (5.2) into sum of

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0}\phi_L(\tau)\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Big(e^{ih^{-1}t\mathcal{A}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\Big)\Big)\,d\tau \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\bar{\phi}_L(\tau)\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\Big(e^{ih^{-1}t\mathcal{A}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\Big)\Big)\,d\tau \tag{5.4}$$

where ϕ, $\bar{\phi}$ are admissible functions, ϕ is supported in $[-1,1]$ and equal to 1 in $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$, $\bar{\phi} = \theta(-\tau)\big(1-\phi(\tau)\big)$, L is a small constant. Now we can use microhyperbolicity in the first term and replace $T = T_1$ by any $T \in [T_0, T_1]$. On the other hand, one can rewrite the second term as

$$\Big(\bar{\phi}_L(hD_t)\Big(\bar{\chi}_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\big(e^{ih^{-1}t\mathcal{A}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\big)\Big)\Big)\Big|_{t=o} \tag{5.5}$$

and then one can replace here $T = T_1$ by any $T \in [T_0^*, T_1]$ where $T_0^* = CL^{-1}h|\log\mu| \ll T_0$. One can see easily that (5.5) is of magnitude $h^{-d} + \mu^r h^{-r}$ and therefore we expect the principal part of asymptotics of the same magnitude. We assume that microhyperbolicity is in the direction $\partial_{\xi_{r+1}}$.

Note that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} h^{-1}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\big(u\psi\big)\Big)\,d\tau = T^{-1}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_{1\,T}(t)\Gamma\big(u\psi\big)\Big)\Big|_{\tau=0} \tag{5.6}$$

with $\chi_1(t) = t^{-1}\chi(t)$; this formula will play very important role below.

Remark 5.1. It follows from propositions 4.2, 4.4-4.6 that in their assumptions expression (5.6) does not exceed $Ch^{-d}\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^l|\log\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)|^{-\sigma}$ and thus

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} h^{-1}\Bigl|\Bigl(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_{T_0}(t)-\bar{\chi}_T(t))\Gamma\bigl(u\psi\bigr)\Bigr)\,d\tau\Bigr| \le C\bigl(h^{-d}+\mu^r h^{-r}\bigr)\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)^l|\log\bigl(\frac{h}{T}\bigr)|^{-\sigma}. \tag{5.7}$$

In particular for $T=\bar{T}_0\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}\epsilon\varepsilon^{-1}h$ the right-hand expression does not exceed remainder estimates we want to prove (in any of our cases). We can even reduce T if smoothness allows. In particular, as $T=\epsilon\mu^{-1}$ we get remainder estimate $Ch^{-d}(\mu h)^l|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$ which is a bit better than in theorem 0.3.

5.2 Case of intermediate magnetic field

We apply method of successive approximations to calculate both terms (5.3) and (5.4). We consider our operator $A_{\mathcal{T}}(x',hD';x'',hD_{x''})$ as a matrix operator and then we take $A_{\mathcal{T}}(x',hD',y'',hD_{x''})$ for unperturbed operator $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}$ (simplifying it later). Then one can see easily that each next term of successive approximations gets an extra factor $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}R$ or $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}R$ where $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ are forward and backward parametrices of $hD_t-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $hD_t-A_{\mathcal{T}}$ respectively and by Duhamel principle their operator norms on interval $[-T,T]$ do not exceed Th^{-1}.

5.2.1 Mollified asymptotics

Each next term of successive approximations when plugged there adds a factor $\|R\|$ to its estimate from above.

Really, it follows from the fact that $t^{-1}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$ and $t^{-1}\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ are operators with norms h^{-1} and factor t either annuls the corresponding term, or is replaced by its commutator with $\phi_L(hD_t)$ thus releasing factor h. So, with (5.5) any perturbation with norm $O(h^{\delta})$ would be good enough to have only a bounded number of successive approximations to be considered, but (x_j-y_j) is even better:

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(x_j-y_j)=(x_j-y_j)\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}-\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}[\bar{A},x_j]\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm} \tag{5.8}$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$, and as explained, these parametrices plugged in (5.5) do not increase upper estimate, while the norm of $[\bar{A},x_j]$ is $O(\mu^{-1}h)$.

Further, perturbations of the form $(A_{\mathcal{T}}-\mathcal{A})$ adds factor $\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ to the corresponding term in (5.5); we take $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ as unperturbed operator in this subsubsection.

So any term of successive approximation but the first one, leads to term in (5.5) not exceeding $\big(\mu^{-1}h+\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\big)\times h^{-d}$ which, in turn, does not exceed the remainder estimate. Therefore

(5.9) *Modulo remainder estimate one can replace in* (5.5) *operator* $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ *by* $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ *leading to expression*

$$(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^r h^{-r}\int\int \bar{\phi}_L(\tau)\,d_\tau\Big(\mathrm{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\Big)\,dx''\,d\xi'' \tag{5.10}$$

where both $\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')$ *and* $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')$ *are considered as "matrices" i.e. as operators in auxiliary space* $\mathbb{H}=L^2(\mathbb{R}^r)$, $\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')\big)$ *is its spectral projector and* Tr' *is a "matrix" trace.*

5.2.2 Non-mollified asymptotics. I

Unfortunately things are not that good for term in (5.3) because parametrices are "worth" of T/h and therefore in view of (5.8) factor (x_j-y_j) is "worth" of $T^2h^{-2}\times\mu^{-1}h \asymp \varepsilon^{-2}\mu^{-1}h|\log h|^2 \asymp \mu h|\log h|^2$ (as $T=T_0$) which is not that small, especially for large μ.

In 2-dimensional case we could always arrange (after appropriate symplectic map [25)]) to have (x_j-y_j) accomplished by extra factor $(\varepsilon+\varepsilon^{l-1}|\log\varepsilon|^{-\sigma})$ because we considered scalar symbol. Here we have essentially matrix symbol and this trick does not work (however it will work for ultra-strong magnetic field). A bit larger ε does not help much as μ is close to h^{-1}. Further, perturbation $(A_{\mathcal{T}}-\mathcal{A})$ is "worth" of $Th^{-1}\times\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}\asymp\varepsilon^{-1}\mu^{-l}|\log h|^{1-\sigma}$ (again as $T=T_0$). In 2-dimensional case we just removed such term at the very beginning.

However, using methods of section 4 we will be able to "place" factor $\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ into estimates of successive approximation terms which will take care of few copies of factor $\frac{T}{h}$.

So, our goal now is to evaluate properly

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\big(u\psi\big)=F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\big(u_{\mathcal{T}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\big) \tag{5.11}$$

as $|\tau|\le\epsilon$.

The idea of successive approximation method is the following: rewriting down

$$(hD_t-A_{\mathcal{T}})u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}}=\mp ih\delta(t)\delta(x-y) \tag{5.12}$$

with $u^{\pm}=u\theta(\pm t)$ and thus

$$u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}}=\mp ih\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\delta(x-y) \tag{5.13}$$

[25)] Which after quantization gives metaplectic transformation.

as

$$(hD_t - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mp ih\delta(t)\delta(x-y) + (A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})u^{\pm} \tag{5.14}$$

with $u^{\pm} = u\theta(\pm t)$ and thus

$$u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mp ih\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\delta(t)\delta(x-y) + \bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})u^{\pm} \tag{5.15}$$

we can iterate the last equation few times:

$$u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mp ih \sum_{0\le k\le m-1} \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\Big)^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\delta(t)\delta(x-y) \mp ih\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\Big)^m \mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\delta(x-y); \tag{5.16}$$

however our latest technique allow usually to take $m = 1$. Applying $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$ from the right we get that

$$u^{\pm}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mp ih \sum_{0\le k\le m-1} \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\Big)^k \bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(x,y) \mp ih\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\Big)^m \mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(x,y) \tag{5.17}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\psi}(x,y)$ is the Schwartz kernel of $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$. From now Γ means that we set both Schwartz kernel arguments equal to y' (the same we used in successive approximations) and then integrate.

Proposition 5.2. *In frames of proposition 4.2 for $T \in [h^{1-\delta}, \bar{T}_0]$*

$$T^{-1}|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}\Big)| \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}. \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore

$$|\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\big(\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0}(t) - \bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}_0^*}(t)\big)\Gamma\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}\Big)\,d\tau| \le C\begin{cases}\mu^{-1}h^{1-d} & \text{as } (l,\sigma)\succeq(2,1),\\ \mu^{1-l}h^{1-d}|\log h|^{-\sigma} & \text{as } (l,\sigma)\prec(2,1)\end{cases} \tag{5.19}$$

and thus does not exceed remainder estimate of theorem 0.7.

Proof. Writing

$$A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}} = \sum_j (x_j - y_j) R_j, \qquad R_j = R_j(x', \mu^{-1}hD'; x'', y'', \mu^{-1}hD'') \tag{5.20}$$

we see that

$$\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}\Big) = \sum_j \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm} R_j \mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi,j}\Big) - i\mu^{-1}h \sum_j \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm} R_j \mathcal{G}^{\pm} A_{\mathcal{T}}^{(j)} \mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}\Big) \tag{5.21}$$

where we used standard commutation relation (5.8) and $\mathcal{K}_{\psi j} = (x_j - y_j)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}$ is the Schwartz kernel of $[x_j, \psi]$. Note that symbols of $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(j)}$, R_j belong to $\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$ while symbol of $[x_j, \psi]$ belongs to $\mu^{-1}h\mathcal{F}^{l-1,\sigma}$.

Therefore due to Duhamel formula the left-hand expression of (5.18) is an absolute value of the sum of

$$\begin{aligned} &-i\mu^{-1}hT^{-1}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\sum_j \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm} R_j \mathcal{G}^{\pm} A_{\mathcal{T}}^{(j)} \mathcal{G}^{\pm}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\Big) = \\ &\qquad -i\mu^{-1}h^{-1}T^{-1}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\sum_j \operatorname{Tr}\times \\ &\qquad \Big(\int_{\{t_1+t_2\le t\}} e^{ih^{-1}(t-t_1-t_2)\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}} R_j e^{ih^{-1}t_1 A_{\mathcal{T}}} A_{\mathcal{T}}^{(j)} e^{ih^{-1}t_2 A_{\mathcal{T}}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\, dt_1\, dt_2\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &T^{-1}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\operatorname{Tr}\sum_j \Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm} R_j \mathcal{G}^{\pm}[x_j, \psi_{\mathcal{T}}]\Big) = \\ &\qquad T^{-1}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\sum_j \operatorname{Tr}\Big(\int_{\{t_1\le t\}} e^{ih^{-1}(t-t_1)\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}} R_j e^{ih^{-1}t_1 A_{\mathcal{T}}}[x_j, \psi_{\mathcal{T}}]\, dt_1\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

For $\eta = ChT^{-1}|\log h|$ let us make η-mollification $A_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$ of (symbol) of $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ and also of ψ; thus we will get also $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$. Note that left-hand expression of (5.18) with $A_{\mathcal{T}}$, $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by $A_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$, $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$ is negligible again due to proposition 3.2. Really, both operators $A_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$, $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\,\eta}$ are microhyperbolic in the same direction.

Consider the difference between (5.21) for η-mollified and original operators.

To do this we apply formula (4.19)-(4.20) assuming first that $l > 1$ and skipping negligible remainder. Then the difference in (5.22) will be

$-i\mu^{-1}h^{-1-k}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\sum_j \operatorname{Tr}$ applied to the sum of the following terms (with constant coefficients)

$$\mu^{-1}h^{-1-k-k_1-k_2}\int_{\Delta_k} e^{ih^{-1}(t-t_1-t_2-\dots-t_k)\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}}\mathcal{C}_1 e^{ih^{-1}t_1\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}}\mathcal{C}_2\cdots\mathcal{C}_k e^{ih^{-1}t_k\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}}\psi' \tag{5.24}$$

where operators $\mathcal{C}_k$ are in some order: one copy of $\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}$ or $(\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}-A^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$, one copy of $R_{j\eta}$ or $(R_{j\eta}-R_j)$ and $(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ constitute the rest; also $\psi'=\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta}$ or $\psi'=(\psi_{\mathcal{T}}-\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ and among all the factors there must be at least one factor which is the difference between mollified and non-mollified operators.

Acting as in the proof of proposition 4.1 we can also gain factor $h^{2q}T^{-2q}\big((\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta}-\tau)^2+\gamma^2\big)^{-q}$ replacing χ by $(-\partial_t^2+\gamma^2T^2h^{-2})^q\chi$; 2-dimensional integral can also appear instead of 3-dimensional (one extra integral comes from Fourier transform).

Each factor $(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ or $(A_{\mathcal{T}}-A_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ is worth of $\eta^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ and is accompanied by a factor not exceeding Th^{-1} while each factor $(\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\rho})$ or $(R_{j\eta}-R_j)$ is worth of $\eta^{l-1}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ and $(\psi_{\mathcal{T}}-\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ is worth of $\eta^l|\log h|^{-\sigma}$.

Then using estimate (4.35) with $\gamma=h/T$ we derive easily that the difference does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-2}|\log h|^{l-\sigma}$ and we arrive to estimate different from the required one by an extra factor $|\log h|^l$.

There are many methods to get rid of this factor; I apply the cheapest one. First, let we apply m iterations in successive approximations and note that each extra iteration brings factor $\mu^{-1}h\times T^2h^{-2}\le \mu h\le |\log h|^{-1}$ and use the same arguments as above; we conclude that instead of $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ we need to consider $\big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\big)^k\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$; so we got rid of $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ but paid for this by a bit more complicated expression. This expression includes also $[x_j-x_k,R_j]$, $[x_j-x_k,A^{(j)}]$ etc but one can see easily that the corresponding terms would satisfy required estimate.

Also, because $l>1$ we see from above mollification arguments that all the terms with more than one factor of $(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$, $(\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ and $(R_j-R_{j\eta})$ satisfy required estimate and thus we need to consider only terms with exactly one such factor. Further, terms containing factor $(\psi_{\mathcal{T}}-\psi_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ satisfy this estimate for sure.

Further, if we replace in such factor η by $\rho_0=h/T$ we will get terms which can be properly estimated and thus in the terms under consideration we can replace $(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ by $(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\rho_0}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})=\sum_n\mathcal{B}_n$, $(\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\eta})$ by $(\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}\rho_0}-\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}eta})=\sum_n\mathcal{B}'_n$ and $(R_j-R_{j\eta})$ by $(R_{j\rho_0}-R_{j\eta})=\sum_n\mathcal{B}''_n$ where $\mathcal{B}_n\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}(\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\rho_n}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}\rho_{n+1}})$ etc where again $\rho_n=2^n\rho_0$.

Now we can just repeat arguments of the proof of proposition 4.1, related to $\mu^{-1}T$-partition with respect to x_1 assuming that microhyperbolicity direction is ∂_{ξ_1}.

On the other hand, if $l=1$, using (4.34) and related integration by part trick (but

without $\mu^{-1}T$-partition), one can see easily that far term in successive approximation satisfy estimate in question and thus to get rid of $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ leaving only $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$.

We can apply mollification and (4.19)–(4.20) skipping terms generated by (4.20); then we arrive to estimate which contains in comparison with desired one extra factor $|\log h|$ and all the terms save the same as above surely satisfy desired estimate. Now we just apply the same $\mu^{-1}T$-partition with respect to x_1 etc as above.

Analysis of (5.23) uses the same technique but is simpler. □

5.2.3 Non-mollified asymptotics. II

Now we are in the shortest-range zone $|t| \le T_0^* = h^{1-\delta}$.

First of all, for $\epsilon h^{\delta-1} \le \mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ we must estimate $F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T\Gamma(u_{\mathcal{T}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}})$. Using successive approximation method in its rough form we conclude that modulo term not exceeding $CTh^{-d}\times \mu^{-1}h(T/h)^2 \asymp \mu^{-1}h^{1-d-3\delta}$ we can replace here u by $u^0_{\mathcal{T}}$ which is a Schwartz kernel of $e^{ih^{-1}t\bar{A}}$. Then calculations show that for $T=T_0^*$ and $\bar{\chi}=1$ on $[-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}]$

$$F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T\Gamma(u^0_{\mathcal{T}}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}) \equiv (2\pi)^{-r}\mu^r h^{1-r}\partial_\tau \int \mathrm{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\,dx''d\xi'' \tag{5.25}$$

modulo negligible term where $\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')\big)$ is the spectral projector of $\mathcal{A}$ considered as operator in $\mathbb{H}$, $\psi(x'',\xi'')$ is also operator in $\mathbb{H}$ and Tr' is a trace in $\mathbb{H}$.

One can see easily that[26)] for small increment $d\tau$ eigenvalue $\omega_J(x'',\xi'')$ of matrix $\mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')$ belongs to $[\tau,\tau+d\tau]$ only for (x'',ξ'') belonging to the set of measure not exceeding $Cd\tau$. Since there are $\asymp(\mu h)^{-r}$ of such eigenvalues we conclude that expression (5.25) does not exceed Ch^{1-d}. This and the previous arguments imply immediately estimate (4.42) with $T=T_0^*$ and thus (4.42) with $T=T_0$ and thus (4.42) with $T=T_1$. Then standard Tauberian arguments imply estimate (1.62). So we have proven

Proposition 5.3. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 for $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$ estimates (4.42) and (1.62) hold.*

Still we need to get more explicit formula:

Proposition 5.4. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 for $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}|\log h|^{-1}$*

$$|\Gamma(\psi\tilde{e})(\tau) - (2\pi)^{-r}\mu^r h^{-r}\int \mathrm{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\,dx''d\xi''| \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}\Big(1+\varepsilon^{l-2}|\log h|^{-\sigma}\Big). \tag{5.26}$$

[26)] Due to microhyperbolicity condition.

Proof. In view of what we proved already we need to prove that

$$|h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_{\psi}\Big)\,d\tau| \tag{5.27}$$

with $T=T_0^*$ does not exceed right-hand expression of (5.26).

Consider expression (5.27) first. Clearly it does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{-d-2}T^3$ and for $T=T_0^*$ it is just $C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d-3\delta}$ and therefore the required estimate holds as $l<2$; so we need to consider case $l\ge 2$ only.

Applying then brute-force successive approximations we conclude that replacing in (5.27) $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}$ by $\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}$ leads to a much smaller error. Also, note that $A_{\mathcal{T}}-\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}}=\sum_j (x_j-y_j)\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}(j)}+\sum_{j,k}(x_j-y_j)(x_k-y_k)R'_{jk}$ with $R'_{jk}\in\mathcal{F}^{l-2,\sigma}$. Then using commutator equality for all (x_j-y_j) factors, we conclude that contribution of these terms will be also much smaller. In the end we are left with term

$$-i\mu^{-1}\sum_j F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}(j)}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\bar{A}^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}\psi_{\mathcal{T}}\Big) \tag{5.28}$$

which is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} &i(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}\sum_j F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\times \\ &\qquad \mathrm{Tr}'\int\Big(\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')A_{\mathcal{T}(j)}(x'',\xi'')\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')A^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\Big)\,dx''d\xi'' \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where we have just matrix-valued symbols $a(x'',\xi'')=A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')$ and we replaced matrix-valued function $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')$ by scalar-valued $\psi^0(x'',\xi'')$; this is legitimate since $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\equiv\psi^0(x'',\xi'')$ modulo $O(\mu^{-1})$.

Using that $\partial_{x_j}\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')=\partial_{x_j}\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')A_{\mathcal{T}(j)}(x'',\xi'')\partial_{x_j}\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')$ and similar identity for ∂_{ξ_j} one can rewrite (5.29) due to trace property and scalarity of ψ^0 as

$$\begin{aligned} &(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\times \\ &\qquad \mathrm{Tr}'\int\Big(\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')B(x'',\xi'')\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\,dx''d\xi''+ \\ &\qquad\qquad \frac{i}{2}(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}'\int\mathcal{G}^{\pm}(x'',\xi'')\psi'(x'',\xi'')\,dx''d\xi'' \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

with $B=-\frac{i}{2}\sum_j A^{(j)}_{\mathcal{T}(j)}$ and $\psi'=\sum_j \psi^{0(j)}_{(j)}$. We can rewrite the first term here as convolution with respect to τ of $L\hat{\bar{\chi}}(L\tau)$ (with $L=Th^{-1}$) with

$$(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}\,\mathrm{Tr}'\,\partial_{\tau}\int\theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)B(x'',\xi'')\psi^0(x''\xi'')\,dx''d\xi''. \tag{5.31}$$

Due to microhyperbolicity and monotonicity of θ with respect to τ this convolution does not exceed $C\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r}\times(\mu h)^{-r}\times(1+\mu^{2-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma})$ where the last factor is just upper bound of $B(x'',\xi'')$ and $(\mu h)^{-r}$ comes from trace Tr' and what we got does not exceed the right-hand expression of (5.26).

We can rewrite the second term in (5.31) as convolution with respect to τ of $L\hat{\bar{\chi}}(L\tau)$ ($L=Th^{-1}$) with

$$(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}\operatorname{Tr}'\int \theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi'(x''\xi'')\,dx''d\xi'' \tag{5.32}$$

and this convolution does not exceed the same expression where factor $(1+\mu^{2-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma})$ this time is an upper bound for ψ'. □

5.2.4 Proof of Theorem 0.5

Now we can decompose

$$(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r}h^{-r}\int \operatorname{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\,dx''d\xi''$$

as

$$(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r}h^{-r}\int \operatorname{Tr}'\,\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}_0(x'',\xi'')\big)\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\,dx''d\xi''+E_{\mathrm{corr}} \tag{5.33}$$

with

(5.34)

$$\begin{aligned}E_{\mathrm{corr}}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}{}&(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r}h^{-r}\int \operatorname{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)-\theta\big(\tau-\mathcal{A}_0(x'',\xi'')\big)\Big)\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\,dx''d\xi''+\\ &(2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r}h^{-r}\int \operatorname{Tr}'\Big(\theta\big(\tau-A_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')\big)\big(\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')-\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\big)\Big)\,dx''d\xi''.\end{aligned}$$

Then making change of variables Ψ^0 in integration we can rewrite the first term in (5.33) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x,\tau)\psi(x)\,dx$ (using (1.17) and (2.28) for Jacobian).

Let us represent (5.34) as $\int \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}_{1\mathrm{corr}}(x,\tau)\psi(x)\,dx$. While it is clearly the case with the first term, in the second term we can rewrite

$$\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(x'',\xi'')-\psi^0(x'',\xi'')=\sum_{1\le|\alpha|+|\beta|\le m}\psi_{\alpha\beta}(x'',\xi'')(x')^{\alpha}(\mu^{-1}hD')^{\beta}+O(\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}) \tag{5.35}$$

with $m = \lfloor (l,\sigma)\rfloor$; then we can just skip the last term (because the output of it will be $O(\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}h^{-d})$). Since $\psi_{\alpha\beta}\circ\Psi_0 = \sum_{\gamma:1\le\gamma\le|\alpha|+\beta|}\rho_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\partial^\gamma\psi(x)$ we can always rewrite the second term in the required form as well. What we are lacking is the estimate for these two terms.

Proposition 5.5. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1*

(i) $E_{\text{corr}} \le C\mu^{-l}h^{-d}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$ *for* $l<2$*;*

(ii) $E_{\text{corr}} \le C\mu^{-2}(\mu h)^{l-2}h^{-d}|\log(\mu h)|^{-\sigma} + C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}$ *for* $2<l<4$*;*

(iii) In particular, $E_{\text{corr}} \le C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}$ *for* $(l,\sigma)\succeq(3,0)$.

So, $l\ge 2$, $(l,\sigma)\prec(3,0)$ is the only case when we cannot skip E_{corr}.

Proof. First of all, let us replace $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ by $\mathcal{A}$. Due to microhyperbolicity and the fact that $(A_{\mathcal{T}}-\mathcal{A})$ is bounded by $C\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$, such operation causes an admissible error $O(\mu^{-l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}h^{-d})$.

(i) Replacing in the second term in (5.34) $\mathcal{A}$ by $\mathcal{A}_0$ we get an error $O(\mu^{-2}h^{-d})$; each factor $(\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{A}_0)$ and $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}-\psi^0$ contributes factor μ^{-1} into remainder estimate. So we need to consider the second term in (5.34) with $A_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by $\mathcal{A}_0$ and with $(\psi_{\mathcal{T}}-\psi^0)$ replaced by ψ^1,

$$\psi^m = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=m} \psi_{\alpha\beta}(x'',\xi'')(x')^\alpha(\mu^{-1}hD')^\beta \tag{5.36}$$

but then after taking trace Tr' we get 0.

In the first term in (5.34) $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_0+\mathcal{A}_1$. Consider $\mathcal{A}_0$ as an unperturbed operator and $\mathcal{A}_0+\mathcal{A}_1$ as a perturbed one. Let us return back to representation (1.62). In view of our previous results we should take $T=\bar T_0=\mu h$ here. Using successive approximation procedure and replacing $\bar\chi_{\bar T_0}(t)$ by $\chi_T(t)$ with $T\in[h,\bar T_0]$ we see that m-th term of successive approximations gives contribution bounded by $Ch^{-d}(\mu^{-1}T/h)^{m-1} = Ch^{-d}(T/\bar T_0)^{m-1}$.

Applying our mollification approach one can prove easily that for $T\in[h^{1-\delta},\bar T_0]$ contribution of m-th term is bounded by $C\mu^{1-m}h^{-d}(h/T)^{l+1-m}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$. Then for $m>l+1$ the sum over t-partition does not exceed $C\mu^{-l}h^{-d}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}$. So we can take $m=3$ here. On interval $[-h^{1-\delta},h^{1-\delta}]$ we just use brute-force estimate of the previous paragraph.

The first term of successive approximations annihilates with the corresponding expression for an unperturbed operator. I remind that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \Big(\mu^2\sum_{j,k}a_{jk}\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k + V\Big)^{\mathrm{w}}$ preserves spaces $\mathcal{H}_m$ and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \Big(2\operatorname{Re}\mu^2\sum_{j,k,p}b_{jkp}\zeta_j^\dagger\zeta_k\zeta^p + \sum_k b_k\zeta_k\Big)^{\mathrm{w}}$ maps $\mathcal{H}_m$ into $\mathcal{H}_{m+1}\oplus\mathcal{H}_{m-1}$ and therefore after taking trace the second term of successive approximations results in 0 for $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by ψ^0.

We need also to consider the similar expressions for $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$ replaced by ψ^1 but in this case the first term of successive approximations vanishes and the second term has a desired estimate.

(ii) On the other hand, for $l > 2$, $(l,\sigma) \preceq (3,0)$ we need to remember that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 + \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$, $\psi_{\mathcal{T}} = \psi^0 + \psi^1 + \psi^2$ and also we need to consider four extra terms (the rest definitely is estimated in desired way) which are[27)]

$$ih^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\sum_{\pm}\mp\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\mathcal{A}_1\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\psi^0\Big)\,d\tau, \tag{5.37}$$

$$ih^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\sum_{\pm}\mp\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\mathcal{A}_2\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\psi^0\Big)\,d\tau, \tag{5.38}$$

$$ih^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\sum_{\pm}\mp\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\mathcal{A}_1\psi^1\Big)\,d\tau, \tag{5.39}$$

$$ih^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{0} F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\,\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\sum_{\pm}\mp\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\psi_2\Big)\,d\tau \tag{5.40}$$

with $T = \bar{T}_0 = \mu h$ and $\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}$ parametrices of $hD_t - \mathcal{A}_0$. Here Tr means that we take $x = y$ and then integrate; I remind that all operators here depend on y.

Replacing $\bar{\chi}_T(t)$ by $\chi_T(t)$ and applying the same technique as before we find that such modified expressions (5.37)–(5.40) do not exceed $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}(h/T)^{l-2}|\log(h/T)|^{-\sigma}$. Then after summation over t-partition we find that contribution of segment $[\bar{T},\bar{T}_0]$ is estimated now by $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}(h/\bar{T})^{l-2}|\log(h/\bar{T})|^{-\sigma}$. We take $\bar{T} = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$. This is clearly possible as

$$\mu \le h^{\delta-1}. \tag{5.41}$$

Assuming this, let us consider contribution of $[-\bar{T},\bar{T}]$. Returning from $\mathcal{T}$ reduction to initial settings we can rewrite (5.37)–(5.40) (modulo terms, estimated properly) as the similar expressions but with $\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}$ replaced by parametrices $\bar{G}^{\pm}$ of operator $\bar{A}$, given by (1.65):

$$\bar{A} = \sum_{j,k}\bar{g}^{jk}\bar{P}_j\bar{P}_k + \bar{V}, \qquad \bar{g}^{jk} = g^{jk}(y), \bar{V} = V(y), \tag{5.42}$$

$$\bar{P}_j = hD_j - V_j(y) - \sum_k(\partial_k V_j)(y)(x_k - y_k),$$

[27)] As we return back to parametrices, cut-off on interval $[-\bar{T}_0,\bar{T}_0]$ etc.

and $\mathcal{A}_j$, ψ^j are replaced by

$$\bar{A}_j = \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|\ge 2+j} \mu^{2-|\alpha|} b_\alpha(y)\bar{P}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|\ge j} \mu^{-|\alpha|} b_\alpha(y)\bar{P}^\alpha, \tag{5.43}$$

$$\bar{\psi}^j = \sum_{\alpha:|\alpha|\ge j} \mu^{-|\alpha|} \psi_\alpha(y)\bar{P}^\alpha \tag{5.44}$$

respectively.

Note that coefficients of all operators are smooth in ε-scale (with $\varepsilon = \mu^{-1}$) which is larger than $Ch|\log h|$ required by the standard theory which is applicable then (after we scale $x \mapsto \mu x$, $h \mapsto \mu h$, $t \mapsto \mu t$ producing that
- before rescaling contribution of intervals $[-\epsilon\mu^{-1}, -Ch|\log h|]$ and $[Ch|\log h|, \epsilon\mu^{-1}]$ are negligible and
- the contribution of interval $[-Ch|\log h|, Ch|\log h|]$ is equal to $\mu^{-2}\sum_{j\ge 0}\kappa_j(\mu h)^j$ with coefficients κ_j which do not depend on μ, h.

We should not care about terms with $j \ge 1$ here because these terms do not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}$. Therefore, $E_{\mathrm{corr}} = \kappa_0\mu^{-2}h^{-d} + O\big(\mu^{-2}(\mu h)^{l-2}|\log(\mu h)|^{-\sigma} + \mu^{-1}h\big)$ (we can alway replace it modulo properly estimated).

Now notice that the "main part" of asymptotics is $\int \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{MW}}(x)\psi(x)\,dx$ which in comparison with theorem 0.3 for $\mu \asymp h^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\log h|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ implies that $\kappa_0 = 0$.

So, *under assumption (5.41) statement (ii) of proposition is proven.*

(iii) To get rid of assumption (5.41) let us return to terms (5.37)–(5.40) with $\bar{\chi}$ replaced by χ and with $T \ge \epsilon\mu^{-1}$.

Each of these expression is equal to $\mu^{-2}h^{-d}f(T/h, \mu h)$ and therefore the above arguments imply estimate

$$\mu h|\log h| \le \epsilon,\ T \ge h^{1-\delta},\ \varepsilon \ge C_0\mu^{-1} \implies |f(\frac{T}{h}, \mu h)| \le C(\frac{h}{T})^{l-2}|\log(\frac{h}{T})|^{-\sigma}. \tag{5.45}$$

This is really strange inequality because its conditions involve T and h separately. This gives us certain flexibility. Namely, let us assume that

$$T \le h^{1-\delta} \tag{5.46}$$

(otherwise everything is fine) and replace $h \mapsto h\lambda$, $T \mapsto T\lambda$, $\mu \mapsto \mu\lambda^{-1}$ which affects neither μh nor (h/T). Conditions of (5.45) should be fulfilled now with these modified h, T, μ. To fulfil the second one we take $\lambda = h^{-1}(hT^{-1})^{\frac{1}{\delta}}$ and this is greater than 1 due to (5.46).

The first of assumptions of (5.45) will survive[28)] but the third one is now replaced by more restrictive $\varepsilon \ge C_0\mu^{-1}\lambda$. To get rid of it let us apply $C\mu^{-1}\lambda$-mollification which leads to the error in $f(T/h, \mu h)$, not exceeding

$$C(\mu^{-1}\lambda)^{l-1}|\log \mu^{-1}\lambda|^{-\sigma}(\frac{T}{h})^2 + C(\mu^{-1}\lambda)^{l}|\log \mu^{-1}\lambda|^{-\sigma}(\frac{T}{h})^3.$$

This is clearly less than the right-hand expression in (5.45) provided $T \ge h(\mu h)^{-\delta'}$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta' > 0$ (δ depends on it). Now inequality (5.45) is proven under this humble assumption. Then one can take $\bar{T} = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ which clearly satisfies it.

The rest of arguments of (ii) hold with no alternation. □

Remark 5.6. Case $l = 2$ is missing in the statement of proposition 5.5.

(i) Using the same arguments as above we find that contribution of zone $\{\bar{T} \le |t| \le \bar{T}_0\}$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}|\log(\mu h)|^{1-\sigma}$ as $\sigma > 1$ and $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}|\log h|^{1-\sigma}$ as $\sigma < 1$ and $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}\bigl|\log\bigl(|\log(\mu h)|/|\log h|\bigr)\bigr|$ as $\sigma = 1$.

On the other hand, contribution of zone $\{|t| \le \bar{T}\}$ will be smaller as $\sigma \le 1$ and $\kappa_0\mu^{-2}h^{-d} + O\bigl(\mu^{-2}h^{-d}|\log(\mu h)|^{1-\sigma}\bigr)$ as $\sigma > 1$ and the same arguments as above show that $\kappa_0 = 0$.

(ii) Further, if either there are no third-order resonances or if g^{jk} and F_{jk} are constant, then $\mathcal{A}_1 = 0$ after proper reduction. I can exploit it properly only for $\sigma \le 0$: one can see easily that then $E_{\mathrm{corr}} \le C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$.

5.3 Case of strong magnetic field

In the strong magnetic field case one can apply the same arguments in the successive approximation method remembering that now $\varepsilon \ge C(\mu^{-1}h|\log h|)^{\frac12}$ and $\bar{T}_0 \le h\varepsilon^{-1} \le (\mu h|\log h|^{-1})^{\frac12}$.

Then propositions 5.2–5.4 and their proofs remain true with this minor modification:

Proposition 5.7. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 for $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}$*
(i) Estimates (5.18) and (5.19) hold;
(ii) Estimates (4.42), (1.62) and (5.26) hold.

▶ Then theorem 0.7 is proven. Also, as $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ all these results hold for $\mu \le Ch^{-1}$.

Furthermore, arguments of proposition 5.5 related to $T \ge \bar{T} = \epsilon\mu^{-1}$ do not change either. However, we need to reconsider contribution of the segment $[-\bar{T}, \bar{T}]$ as $l > 2$. Again, we need to consider only the sum of terms (5.37)–(5.40).

[28)] In fact, it will be fulfilled as long as $\mu h|\log(h/T)| \le \epsilon'$.

We already know from the proof of proposition 5.5(ii) that under assumptions $\mu h|\log h \le \epsilon$, $\varepsilon \ge C\mu^{-1}$ this sum does not exceed $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}(\mu h)^{l-2}|\log(\mu h|)^{-\sigma}$. On the other hand, all terms (5.37)–(5.40) with $T = \bar{T}$ and their sum have the form $\mu^{-2}h^{-d}f(\mu h)$ and then repeating arguments of part (iii) of the proof of proposition 5.5 with $\lambda = \mu^K h^{K-1}$ we arrive to the same estimate $C\mu^{-2}h^{-d}(\mu h)^{l-2}|\log(\mu h|)^{-\sigma}$ for the sum as $\mu h \le \epsilon'$. Furthermore, remark 5.6 remains true as well:

Proposition 5.8. *Under microhyperbolicity condition 0.1 for $\mu \le \epsilon h^{-1}$ proposition 5.5 and remark 5.6 remain true.*

5.4 Case of superstrong magnetic field

I remind that in this case we use decomposition (3.17) and proposition 3.15 hold and we have equation

$$(hD_t - \mathcal{A})U \equiv 0, \qquad U|_{t=0} \equiv \delta(x' - y') \tag{5.47}$$

where $U = (U_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha,\beta\in\mathfrak{A}}$ with $\#\mathfrak{A} \le C$ and furthermore $\#\mathfrak{A} = 1$ under condition (0.36)–(0.37) and $\mathcal{A} = (cA_{\alpha\beta})_{\alpha,\beta\in\mathfrak{A}}$ having symbol of $\mathcal{F}^{l,\sigma}$.

I also remind that we replace condition 0.1 by condition 0.2 which is equivalent to microhyperbolicity (at level 0) condition to $\mathcal{A}$. Then we can apply successive approximation method to this system rather than to the original reduced operator and prove immediately

Proposition 5.9. *Let <u>either</u> $\epsilon h^{-1} \le \mu \le Ch^{-1}$ and $\#\mathfrak{N} = 1$ in the microhyperbolicity condition 0.2, <u>or</u> (0.35)–(0.19) hold, <u>or</u> (0.36)–(0.38) hold.*

Then

(i) The following estimates hold:

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma(u\psi)| \le C\mu^r h^{1-r}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-1}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}\Big(1+\frac{T}{\bar{T}_0}\Big)^{-s} \tag{5.48}$$

with $\bar{T}_0 = \varepsilon^{-1}h$ and

$$|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(u\psi)| \le C\mu^r h^{1-r} \tag{5.49}$$

for $T \in [Ch\mu^\delta, T_1]$, $T_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon\mu$, $|\tau| \le \epsilon$.

(ii) Further, the following estimates hold:

$$T^{-1}|F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau}\chi_T(t)\Gamma\Big(\bar{\mathcal{G}}^{\pm}(A_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}})\mathcal{G}^{\pm}\delta(t)\mathcal{K}_\psi\Big)| \le C\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r}\big(\frac{h}{T}\big)^{l-2}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma} \tag{5.50}$$

for $T \in [Ch\mu^{\delta}, T_1]$, $|\tau| \le \epsilon$.

(iii) Therefore

$$|\Gamma(\psi\tilde{e})(\tau) - h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\Big)\,d\tau'| \le C\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r} \qquad \forall \tau : |\tau| \le \epsilon \tag{5.51}$$

for any $T \in [\bar{T}_0, T_1]$, $|\tau| \le \epsilon$.

This immediately imply

Proposition 5.10. *In frames of proposition 5.9*

$$\begin{aligned}|h^{-1}\int_{-\infty}^{\tau}\Big(F_{t\to h^{-1}\tau'}\bar{\chi}_T(t)\Gamma(\psi u)\Big)\,d\tau' - \\ (2\pi)^{-r}\mu^{r-1}h^{-r}\operatorname{Tr}'\theta\Big(\tau - \mathcal{A}(x'',\xi'')\Big)\psi^0(x'',\xi'')\,dx''d\xi''| \le \\ C\mu^{r-1}h^{1-r} + C\mu^{r}h^{-r}\varepsilon^{l}|\log\mu|^{-\sigma}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.52}$$

► Then theorem 0.9 is proven.

5.5 Condition $|V| \ge \epsilon_0$

Remark 5.11. (i) Assumption $|V| \ge \epsilon_0$ is automatically fulfilled in the superstrong magnetic field case. In the intermediate and strong magnetic field cases we divided by V in microhyperbolicity condition 0.1. However, it is not a problem: we could assume in advance that

$$|V| + |\nabla V| \ge \epsilon_0 \tag{5.53}$$

and then condition 0.1 will be needed in zone $\{x : |V(x)| \ge \epsilon_0'\}$ only. This approach is not applicable to estimates of E_{corr}.

(ii) In the case of a weak magnetic field case we can apply rescaling technique with scaling parameter $\gamma = \epsilon|V|$. Then $h \mapsto h\gamma^{-\frac{3}{2}}$, $\mu \mapsto \mu\gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as long as $\gamma \ge C(\mu^{-2} + \mu^4h^2)$ and $\varepsilon = C\mu h|\log h| \mapsto \varepsilon_{\mathrm{new}} = C\gamma^{-1}\mu h|\log h\gamma^{-\frac{3}{2}}|$. Then contribution of $B(x,\gamma(x))$ to semiclassical error $(C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d})$ does not exceed $C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}\gamma^{(3d-4)/2}$ and multiplying by $\gamma^{-d}\,d\gamma$ and integrating we get $C\mu^{-1}h^{1-d}$ again. With semiclassical error $C\mu^{1-l}h^{1-d}|\log h|^{-\sigma}$ we do equally good as $(l,\sigma) \succ (2,0)$.

For $\mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ as $|V| \le \mu^{-2}$ we take $\gamma = C\mu^{-2}$ and then $h \mapsto h\mu^3 \le 1$, $\mu \mapsto 1$ and we are in frames of the standard case when assumption $|V| \ge \epsilon$ was not needed.

For $h^{-\frac{1}{3}} \le \mu \le h^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ as $|V| \le \mu^4 h^2$ we take $\gamma = C\mu^4 h^2$ and then $h \mapsto \mu^{-6} h^{-1}$, $\mu \mapsto \mu^3 h$, and we find ourselves in the intermediate magnetic field case when assumption $|V| \ge \epsilon$ was not needed as well (unless we want to estimate correction terms).

On the other hand, in the original scale ε_{new} is replaced by $\varepsilon_{\text{new}}\gamma = \varepsilon$ and thus one can check easily that approximation error remains $C(\mu h)^l |\log h|^{l-\sigma} h^{-d}$.

References

[BrIvr] M. Bronstein, V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. Pushing the Limits*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 99–123.

[Dim] M. Dimassi. *Développements asymptotiques de l'oprateur de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique fort*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **26** (2001) 3&4, 595–627.

[Ivr1] V. Ivrii. *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics, Springer-Verlag*, SMM, 1998, xv+731.

[Ivr2] V. Ivrii. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. I*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **4** (1996) 1, 29–74.

[Ivr3] V. Ivrii. *Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. II*, Russian Journal of Math. Phys., **5** (1997) 3, 321–354.

[Ivr4] V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, (2000) 22, 1155–1166.

[Ivr5] V. Ivrii. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. II. Boundary and Degenerations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 125–156.

[Ivr6] V. Ivrii. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. III Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field, (to appear).*

[Ivr7] V. Ivrii. *Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients. V Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field, (in progress).*

[Ivr8] V. Ivrii. *Accurate spectral asymptotics for periodic operators*, Journés "Équations aux Drivés Partielles" (Saint-Jean-de-Monts, 1999), Exp. No. V, 11 pp., Univ. Nantes, Nantes, 1999.

[MeRo] M. Melgaard, G. Rozenblum *Eigenvalue asymptotics for weakly perturbed dirac and Schrödinger operators with constant magnetic fields of full rank*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 1–52.

[Rai1] G. Raikov. *Border-line eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential Integral Equations*, Operator Theory, **14** (1991) 6, 875–888.

[Rai2] G. Raikov. *Strong electric field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Lett. Math. Phys., **21** (1991) 1, 41–49.

[Rai3] G. Raikov. *Strong-electric-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the perturbed magnetic Schrödinger operator* Comm. Math. Phys., **155** (1993) 2, 415–428.

[Rai4] G. Raikov. *Semiclassical and weak-magnetic-field eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with electromagnetic potential*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor., **61** (1994) 2, 163–188.

[Rai5] G. Raikov. *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator in strong constant magnetic fields* Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **23** (1998) 9–10, 1583–1619.

August 22,2003

Department of Mathematics,
University of Toronto,
100, St.George Str.,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3
Canada
ivrii@math.toronto.edu
Fax: (416)978-4107